

Synopsis of the Future *

The purpose of this report is to extend the discussion in synopsis criticism begun in my earlier paper⁽¹⁾. The focal question remains the same: what is the relationship between synopsis construction and the Synoptic Problem⁽²⁾? Taking recently published research into account, this report will consider the question: Can there be a neutral synopsis? In the second part of the report, I make a few proposals regarding synopses of the future. The new synopses will be designed to facilitate the three basic tasks of Gospel research, namely, text criticism, analysis of the pre-composition oral tradition period (form criticism), and research on the different Evangelists' techniques of composition (redaction criticism).

A. Can There Be a Neutral Synopsis?

As Huck had before him, H. Greeven insisted in the preface to his revision of Huck-Lietzmann's *Synopse* that his arrangement sought to "maintain a strict neutrality before the various solutions of the Synoptic Problem"⁽³⁾. Similarly, F. Neirynck recently insisted that "a gospel synopsis cannot be bound to one particular theory"⁽⁴⁾.

* This paper was originally presented at the Jerusalem Symposium on the Interrelations of the Gospel, April 1984. Funds for research were provided by the University of Tennessee.

⁽¹⁾ "Theory of Synopsis Construction", *Bib* 61 (1980) 305-329.

⁽²⁾ Dom Bernard Orchard initially drew the attention of the scholarly world to the little-realized correlation between synopsis construction and the Synoptic Problem in his article, "Are All Gospel Synopses Biassed?", *TZ* 34 (1978) 149-162.

⁽³⁾ H. GREEVEN-A. HUCK, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (13 Aufl., völlig neu bearbeitet; Tübingen 1981) v.

⁽⁴⁾ F. NEIRYNCK, "The Sermon on the Mount in the Gospel Synopsis", *ETL* 52 (1976) 350-357; see p. 356 [rpr, in *Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia*, ser. V fasc. 21].

It is my impression that most scholars agree with this view. Nevertheless, I must ask: how is it possible for a synopsis to be strictly neutral with respect to a solution to the Synoptic Problem? No one has yet demonstrated whether this is even possible. On the contrary, the evidence seems to indicate that it is quite impossible. It comes from both levels which make up any and all synopses: (1.) the text, and (2.) the arrangement of the text, which depends on (3.) the division into pericopes. We will consider each of these in turn.

1. The text of any synopsis cannot be neutral

At the second Ampleforth Conference on the Gospels (April 1983), hosted by Dom Henry Wansbrough of Ampleforth Abbey, G. D. Kilpatrick observed that modern text criticism of the Gospel tended to rely on the Two Document Hypothesis. This was of course news to no one. In his *Textual Commentary on the United Bible Societies' New Testament* (the third edition), B. Metzger had listed among the "internal evidence" used by the UBS editorial committees, "The priority of the Gospel According to Mark", saying that this theory functioned to help them decide "what the author [of Luke or Matthew or Mark] was more likely to have written"⁽⁵⁾. For example, it would have been presupposed in the committee's decisions to adopt readings reflecting what they thought were the original author's style and vocabulary⁽⁶⁾. This is because most existing discussions of the evangelists' linguistic usage do presuppose the Two Document Hypothesis⁽⁷⁾. An exception is M. E. Boismard and others, who simply count the occurrences of a word using their concor-

⁽⁵⁾ See B. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament. A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament (third edition)* (London-New York 1971) xxvii f.

⁽⁶⁾ Ibid.

⁽⁷⁾ See however, the forthcoming trio of monographs on the style of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, respectively, to be published by Mercer University Press: David Peabody on Mark, Frank Collison on Luke, and Dennis Tevis on Matthew. These will be the first studies of the style of the evangelists that consciously strive to be independent of any source theory in the way they analyze the texts.

dances, thinking that the resulting ratios are evidence of "vocabulary preference" — a singularly ill-considered kind of approach⁽⁸⁾.

The treatment of "harmonizations" is another kind of "internal evidence" mentioned by Metzger that required the assumption of the Two Document Hypothesis⁽⁹⁾. For example, if one assumes that Matthew and Luke independently copied material from Mark (as the Two Document Hypothesis stipulates), and, in a passage where both have one reading that is different from the parallel in Mark but the same as the other's, and other readings where they differ from Mark and also from each other, the UBS committees usually chose the latter readings on the grounds that Matthew and Luke would not have independently changed the text of Mark in precisely the same way⁽¹⁰⁾. But if one hypothesizes the opposite situation, i.e., that Luke copied directly from the Gospel of Matthew (as is stipulated in the Two Gospel and so-called Augustinian Hypotheses⁽¹¹⁾), then a reading where both diverged from the text of Mark in precisely the same way would be chosen as the more original reading. So it is obvious that the theory one chooses will make a considerable difference.

Here is a concrete illustration of the close relationship between source criticism and text criticism. In A. Lindemann's recently published survey of research on the Synoptic Gospels⁽¹²⁾, he makes this observation on Greeven's decision to print the longer reading in Mark 10,21 *ἀπας τὸν σταυρόν* (supported by $\mathfrak{R} \text{AG} \Phi \text{sy}^{\text{p.s}} \lambda \text{Wbo}^{\text{p.s}}$, etc.). If Greeven is right, this would add another case of a negative

(8) See, for a typical example, Boismard's list of "caractéristiques lucaniennes du rédacteur matthéen", *Synopse*, II p. 38.

(9) METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, p. xxvii.

(10) See the comments of K. ELLIOTT, "Textual Criticism, Assimilation and the Synoptic Gospels", *NTS* 26 (1979/80) 231-242. For the work of K. ALAND and B. ALAND, see most recently: *Der Text des Neuen Testaments. Einführung in die wissenschaftlichen Ausgaben sowie in Theorie und Praxis der modernen Textkritik* (Stuttgart 1982) 292f.

(11) I use the term so-called since what is universally believed to have been Augustine's view of the sequence of composition is erroneous; the actual Augustinian view has only recently been rediscovered; see David B. PEABODY, "Augustine and the Augustinian Hypothesis: A Reexamination of... de consensu evangelistarum", *New Synoptic Studies* (ed. W. R. FARMER) (Macon, Ga. 1983) 37-64.

(12) "Literaturbericht zu den Synoptischen Evangelien 1978-1983", *TRu* 49 (1984) 223-276.

"minor agreement" of Matthew and Luke against Mark. The shorter reading in Mark (found in B x C D Δ Θ Ψ etc.) is, in Greeven's opinion, a case of later assimilation of Mark to the shorter text of Matthew and Luke. Lindemann notes:

Die Gegenfrage (Warum haben Mt und/oder Lk den Hinweis auf das Kreuztragen von Mk nicht übernommen?) setzt die Hypothese der Mk-Priorität voraus und enthält insofern kein im eigentlichen Sinn textkritisches Argument.⁽¹³⁾

But this strict dichotomy is actually rather misleading, as Lindemann concedes in a telling parenthesis added immediately:

(Wenn freilich, wovon ich allerdings überzeugt bin, aus vielerlei anderen Gründen die Mk-Priorität außer Frage steht, dann ist der Kurz text bei Mt und Lk wohl doch ein Indiz dafür, daß beide in ihrer Vorlage den Langtext nicht lasen — und dafür spricht ja schließlich auch die Qualität des Handschriftenbefundes bei Mk.)⁽¹⁴⁾

Here we clearly see the interplay between text criticism and source criticism. Although some scholars are a little uneasy with Metzger's forthright admission that the UBS editorial committee used the Two Document Hypothesis as part of their "internal evidence", I would argue that he did the right thing in identifying the hypothesis which they used, since text critics cannot avoid using some sort of source theory in any case⁽¹⁵⁾.

In fact, there are some indications that the source theory is more important, in one sense, than the manuscript evidence. Consider the view of the text critics who deny that there is any real distinction between "internal" and "external" criteria. They assert that the process of constructing a critical text is not a neat, logical procedure at all. For one thing, the manuscript evidence is often ambiguous and contradictory, defying neat categorization. In a famous reversal of Westcott and Hort's maxim: "Knowledge of documents should precede final judgement upon readings", C. H. Turner

⁽¹³⁾ Ibid., 249.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Ibid.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See on this whole subject, the excellent article by G. D. FEE, "Modern Text Criticism and the Synoptic Problem", *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-critical Studies 1776-1976* (J. B. ORCHARD and T. R. W. LONGSTAFF, eds) (Cambridge 1978) 154-169. See further, IDEM, "A Text-critical Look at the Synoptic Problem", *NT* 22 (1980) 12-28.

prefaced his exhaustive study of Marcan style by saying, "Knowledge of an author's usage should precede final judgement upon readings"⁽¹⁶⁾. E. Epp comments: Turner "indicated in a striking fashion the need to take internal evidence most seriously, particularly stylistic and philological features, and that these are crucial if not conclusive in text-critical decisions"⁽¹⁷⁾. G. D. Kilpatrick agreed, saying:

... the decision [as to the best reading] rests ultimately with the criteria [concerning harmonization, style, language and theology] as distinct from the manuscripts, and our evaluation of the manuscripts must be determined by [these] criteria.⁽¹⁸⁾

In striking contrast to all this, particularly in view of the explicit testimony of two of his fellow committee members (Metzger and Kilpatrick) on the UBS editorial committee, Kurt Aland has not indicated one way or the other what his own views are of the relationship between text criticism and source criticism⁽¹⁹⁾. One would have thought that in his latest and most comprehensive statement of the theory and practice of text criticism, there would be some sort of discussion of this fundamental question, but this does not seem to be the case⁽²⁰⁾. This gaping lacuna in his definitive statement of

⁽¹⁶⁾ C. H. TURNER, "Marcan Usage", *JTS* 25 (1923-24) 377. Cited in E. EPP, "The Eclectic Method in New Testament Textual Criticism: Solution or Symptom?", *HTR* 69 (1976) 211-257; reference on p. 250.

⁽¹⁷⁾ EPP, "Eclectic Method", 250.

⁽¹⁸⁾ G. D. KILPATRICK, "Western Text and Original Text in the Gospel and Acts", *JTS* 44 (1943) 25-26; cited in EPP, "Eclectic Method", 251.

⁽¹⁹⁾ This curious lacuna is true of all his writings on text criticism, but see especially his most recent, definitive work: *Einführung in ... der Textkritik*.

⁽²⁰⁾ In this respect, the "Zwölf Grundregeln für die textkritische Arbeit", are at once curiously vague and old-fashioned. Although his research institute has performed a magnificent service in collecting and comparing manuscripts and critical editions, as a theoretician, K. Aland leaves much to be desired. Although he uses commonly accepted principles, his central tendency seems to be what one might call trained intuition. As proof of this, consider Grundregel 12: "Die ständig erneuerte Erfahrung im Umgang mit der handschriftlichen Überlieferung ist die beste Lehrmeister in der Textkritik. Wer produktiv an ihr teilnehmen will, sollte vorher mindestens eine großen frühen Papyrus, eine bedeutend Majuskel und eine wichtige Minuskel voll-

text critical methodology is all the more regrettable, because it appears that he played a major role in shaping the text used by the United Bible Societies.

H. Greeven shows that he is fully cognizant of the dimensions of the interplay of text criticism and source criticism. In the preface to his new synopsis he writes:

[Harmonistic readings have been excluded from the text, but fully included in the apparatus. In this way, scholars can clearly see that] the Synoptic Problem is mirrored precisely in the history of the text, namely in an unremitting tendency to harmonization. We must always keep before our eyes this trend and especially the significant tendency to assimilate to Matthew, if we wish appropriately to investigate textual questions in the Synoptic Gospels.⁽²¹⁾

In conclusion, with the possible exception of Kurt Aland (for whom we have no explicit statement one way or the other), all scholars seem to agree that the process of establishing a critical text of the Gospels cannot be "neutral" with regard to a consistent and rigorous use of one particular source hypothesis (eclectic use of a number of different hypotheses must be avoided). Hopefully, it will be the correct hypothesis!

Of course, this means that all text critics are involved in *circulus in probando*:

1. Young scholars are taught to use a critical text (e.g., Nestle-Aland 26th or UBS 3rd) which has been prepared by a committee consistently assuming the Two Document Hypothesis.

2. Using this text, they form their own impressions of the likelihood of the priority of the composition of Mark and the secondary or derivative character of Matthew and Luke.

3. Then they complete their doctorates and perhaps are fortunate enough to find employment in a famous institute for text criticism where — under the guidance of the master — they continue to shape the text of the Gospels using this hypothesis . . .

ständig kollationiert haben, die reinen Theoretiker haben in der Textkritik oft genug mehr Schaden als Nutzen angerichtet" (p. 283). Note how this 'rule' does not prescribe any methodological or scientific procedure at all. It merely recommends to all would-be text critics that they get plenty of exercise with the texts. Is this supposed to magically train the text-critic's nose to find the right reading?

⁽²¹⁾ *Synopse*, vi.

4. . . . so that future generations of young scholars will read *their* critical texts and see how true the Two Document Hypothesis is according to the evidence in their critical texts — perhaps by then labeled “the new Standard Text”.

5. And so the cycle repeats itself.

Two observations. First, we must not be under the illusion that this circular process is avoidable.

Second, the only defense against the dangers obviously inherent in such a circular situation is to produce a variety of critical texts relying upon different source hypotheses, so that, by comparing critical texts, we will at least have some idea how much difference each source theory makes. In this respect, the new text and apparatus of H. Greeven is a major contribution. Similarly, *The Greek New Testament According to the Majority Text*, edited by Z. C. Hodges and A.L. Farstad (Nashville – Camden – New York 1982), is also important to have — if only for purposes of comparison. Likewise, the new Greek synopsis of Orchard is another example of what must be done. Confronted by a critical text based upon the priority of Mark, Orchard had no choice but to work out his own text. His hypothesis (the Two Gospel Hypothesis) said that Luke had directly copied Matthew, and so readings in Luke and Mark that had been discarded by Nestle and Aland as secondary assimilations were restored by Orchard as more original⁽²²⁾. In a few reviews, Orchard was chided for creating a “biased text” — as if the reviewers themselves were somehow in possession of an unbiased text.

2. *The arrangement of any synopsis cannot be neutral*

The two most widely used synopses in the world today each claim to be “objective” arrangements of the Gospel text, “neutral” with regard to the Synoptic Problem in the way the texts are paral-

⁽²²⁾ See his Table in *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in Greek* (Edinburgh 1983) 307-340. In general, Orchard preferred to leave dubious longer readings in the text, marked off by half-brackets (more than 60 times, including the Longer Ending of Mark). However, it is clear that Orchard (working with G. Kilpatrick) only dealt with some of the more important cases. A thorough reconstruction of the text of the Gospels on the basis of the Two Gospel Hypothesis still remains to be done.

leled to each other. If these claims are correct, it would seem appropriate to expect these synopses to be nearly identical in (a) the number of pericopes, and (b) the arrangement of pericopes. What is in fact the situation?

Huck has a total of 259 pericopes while Aland has 304 (excluding the strictly Johannine passages). Out of these totals, approximately 190 are similar — which was to be expected. Around 110 (roughly 33%) are different — which is too many if these are “neutral” synopses. The differences are of three kinds: in approximately 30 pericopes Huck has material in one pericope which Aland has divided into two pericopes; second, there are 4 cases where Huck has one pericope which Aland has divided into three pericopes; and third, about 40 pericopes have been divided differently⁽²³⁾. Is either of them the “neutral” synopsis?

In practice, the synopsis editor divides up the Gospel narratives with one eye constantly on divisions he has already made in the parallel Gospels. The process of dividing up the material and the process of arranging the primary parallels take place simultaneously and influence each other continuously as the synopsis editor moves back and forth, shaping and arranging the parallels in his synopsis. Once the primary parallels are lined up, the secondary and tertiary parallels are inserted into the outline. Faced with the complex and subjective judgements all this calls for, any pretence of “neutrality” or “objectivity” on the part of the synopsis editor must vanish into thin air. There is, unfortunately, no Ariadne’s thread to guide the synopsis editor through the labyrinth of Synoptic interrelationships.

I am aware that this is not the conventional wisdom on the matter. F. Neirynck’s comment reflects the consensus:

Modern synopses [have as] their basic principle . . . to present the text of each gospel in its consecutive order and to repeat gospel sections out of order as often as the parallelization with the other gospels may require. This principle is clear enough and it should normally result in an objective tool for the comparative study of the gospels.⁽²⁴⁾

⁽²³⁾ Although the text has been completely recast, Greeven did not to my knowledge change Huck’s pericope divisions except in a few minor cases.

⁽²⁴⁾ “The Sermon on the Mount in the Gospel Synopsis”, *ETL* 52 (1976) 350. K. ALAND’S version of this “basic principle” is quite similar: “This Synopsis can be used apart from all theories of source criticism, for the text of each of the four Gospels has been reproduced in its continuity . . . For

We have all heard this oft-repeated principle. It is ironic to see it quoted again on the rare occasion when Neiryck himself will bring forward absolutely devastating evidence against it. Nevertheless, in doing so Neiryck has performed the valuable service of focusing attention precisely upon the fatal flaw in this "basic principle": it says nothing whatever about the synoptic editor's repeated experience of having arbitrarily to choose between equally valid alternative configurations of primary parallel pericopes. Consider this question: where should the synopsis-maker put the Sermon on the Mount vis-à-vis the order of Mark?

(Table I)

WHERE SHOULD THE SERMON ON THE MOUNT
BE PARALLELED TO MARK⁽²⁵⁾?

1. The arrangement of Tischendorf, Lagrange, Larfeld, Burton-Goodspeed, Benoit, Aland, Orchard.

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
	1,21-28 Heal in syna- gogue	4,31-37 Heal in syna- gogue
	1,29-31 Peter's mother- in-law	4,38-39 Peter's mother- in-law
	1,32-34 Healing in eve- ning	4,40-41 Healing in eve- ning
	1,35-38 Jesus leaves Ca- pharnaum	4,42-43 Jesus leaves Ca- pharnaum

every section of the Synopsis all the relevant passages of the other Gospels are given again in full, and in this way the user has each time the entire material placed before his eyes in what I hope is a perspicuous form" (Preface, *Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum* [³1965] xi).

⁽²⁵⁾ These tables are based on the article by F. Neiryck, "The Sermon on the Mount". Besides the location of the Sermon on the Mount Neiryck proposes several other alternative arrangements (see pp. 351 f.). These will no doubt be seen in his forthcoming Dutch synopsis.

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
4,23 Preaching in Galilee	1,39 Preaching in Galilee	4,44 Preaching in Galilee
	1,40-45 Heal leper	5,1-11 Catch of fish
	2,1-12 Heal paralytic	5,12-16 Heal leper
	2,13-17 Call of Levi	5,17-26 Heal paralytic
	2,18-22 Question of John	5,27-32 Call of Levi
	2,23-28 Grain on sabbath	5,33-39 Question of John
	3,1-6 Heals hand	6,1-5 Grain in on sabbath
	3,7-12 Heal multitudes	6,6-11 Heals hand
	3,13-19 Call of Twelve	6,12-16 Call of Twelve
4,24-5,2 Great crowds gather from all directions		6,17-20a Heals multitudes
5,3-7,29 Sermon on the Mount		6,20b-49 Sermon on the Plain
8,1-4 Heal leper		
8,5-13 Centurion's servant		7,1-10 Centurion's servant

Comments:

a. These editors do not seem to be primarily intent on locating the Sermons at the most appropriate point in Mark's order. Instead, they appear to have been primarily concerned to bring together two sets of redactional passages in Matt and Luke, namely, the preaching and healing summary in Matt 4,23//Mark 1,39//Luke 4,44, and the preaching and healing summary in Matt 4,24-5,2//Luke 6,17-20 a.

b. This arrangement has the additional attraction of bringing the two Sermons of Matthew and Luke opposite to each other.

c. The result is that the Sermon on the Mount comes after Mark 3,13-19, which is not about a sermon at all, but the Call of the Twelve. To be sure, Mark opens the scene by saying Jesus "went up on a mountain". But even so, locating the Sermons at this point in Mark's order seems more like an unavoidable necessity than an appropriate parallel location.

(Table II)

2. The arrangement of Huck (incl. translations) Schmid, Sparks, *et al.*

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
	1,21-28 Heal in syna- gogue	4,31-37 Heal in syna- gogue
	1,29-31 Peter's mother- in-law	4,38-39 Peter's mother- in-law
	1,32-34 Healing in eve- ning	4,40-41 Healing in eve- ning
	1,35-38 Jesus leaves Ca- pharnaum	4,42-43 Jesus leaves Ca- pharnaum
4,23 Preaching in Gali- lee	1,39 Preaching in Gali- lee	4,44 Preaching in Gali- lee
		5,1-11 Catch of fish
5,1-7,29 Sermon on Mount		
8,1-4 Heal leper	1,40-45 Heal leper	5,12-16 Heal leper
8,5-13 Centurion's ser- vant		
8,14-15 Peter's mother- in-law		
8,16-17 Discipleship		
8,18-22 Saying about discipleship		
8,23-27 Calming of storm		
8,28-34 Gadarene de- moniac		
9,1-8 Heal paralytic	2,1-12 Heal paralytic	5,17-26 Heal paralytic
9,9-13 Call of Levi	2,13-17 Call of Levi	5,27-32 Call of Levi
9,14-17 Fasting	2,18-22 Fasting	5,33-39 Fasting
9,18-26 Jairus' daughter		
9,27-31 Two blind men		
9,32-34 Heal two de- moniacs		
9,35-10,16 Send out Twelve		
10,17-11,1 Mission ser- mon		
11,2-6 Baptist's ques- tion		

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
11,7-19 Jesus' words on John the Baptist		
11,20-24 Woe to Gali- lean cities		
11,25-27 Jesus thanks the Father		
11,28-30 Comfort for heavy-laden		
12,1-8 Plucking grain on sabbath	2,23-28 Grain on sab- bath	6,1-5 Grain on sabbath
12,9-14 Heals man's hand	3,1-6 Heals man's hand	6,6-11 Heals man's hand
12,15-21 Heals multi- tudes	3,7-12 Heals multitudes	6,17-19 (sic) Heals mul- titudes
	3,13-19 Call of Twelve	6,12-16 (sic) Call of Twelve
		6,20-49 Sermon on Plain

Comments:

a. Judging from Huck's placement of the Sermon on the Mount directly after Mark's summary in 1,39, rather than Mark 3,19, it would seem that Huck arranged Matthew's material with an eye on the Markan outline rather than Luke's (in contrast to the synopses listed above).

b. An even clearer sign that Mark's order is still guiding Huck is the placement of Luke 6,17-19 (Healing of the Multitudes) next to Mark 3,7-12. He then puts Luke 6,12-16 (Call of the Twelve) beside Mark 3,13-19, and prints it in regular type (with bold for the heading), despite the fact that it is out of order. This is conclusive proof that Huck is still allowing his belief in the priority of Mark to guide his arrangement of the primary order of parallel pericopes, despite what he said in the preface about his synopsis being "neutral". Strangely, Schmid does exactly the same thing.

(Table III)

3. Neiryneck's proposal (the same arrangement as Griesbach's chart).

MATTHEW	MARK	LUKE
4,23-5,2 Summary pas- sage	1,21 Preach in Caphar- naum	4,31 Preach in Caphar- naum
5,3-7,27 Sermon on Mount		
7,28-29; 8,1 Conclusion	1,22 "Astonished at his teaching"	4,32 "Astonished at his teaching"
	1,23-28 Heal in syna- gogue	4,33-37 Heal in syna- gogue
8,2-4 Heal leper		
8,5-13 Centurion's ser- vant		
8,14-17 Peter's mother- in-law	1,29-34 Peter's mother- in-law	4,38-41 Peters' mother- in-law
	1,35-39 Simon follows Jesus	4,42-44 Simon follows Jesus
	1,40-45 Heal leper	5,1-11 Catch of fish
		5,12-16 Heal leper
		—
		—
		—
		6,20-49 Sermon on Plain

Comments:

a. Neiryneck writes: "Huck's arrangement of the gospel parallels needs further correction in this section" ⁽²⁶⁾, by which he means his arrangement. "All agree", he adds, that "Matt. 4,23(-25) is parallel to Mark 1,16-20... and that the conclusion of the Sermon in Matt. 7,28b-29 clearly corresponds with Mark 1,22" ⁽²⁷⁾. Hence, concludes Neiryneck, Huck's arrangement, as well as the older one, is to be rejected.

⁽²⁶⁾ Ibid., 355.

⁽²⁷⁾ Ibid.

b. Neirynck goes on to note that his arrangement is congenial to the redactional programmes of both the Two Document Hypothesis as well as the Two Gospel Hypothesis, and therefore his arrangement should be adopted by the adherents of each school of thought ⁽²⁸⁾.

General observations on Tables I, II and III.

1. There does not seem to be any formal justification or necessary reason for choosing one of these arrangements over against the other two. Neirynck tries to make a case for his arrangement, but his literary evidence is very slight, and by no means universally accepted. Table I shows that other considerations lead to different arrangements. Neirynck points these out, noting that the arrangement in Table I is preferred by those who hold the Proto-Mark Hypothesis, as well as the so-called "Primitive Oral Gospel" Hypothesis. He thinks his arrangement will be more useful to adherents of the Two Document Hypothesis and the Two Gospel Hypothesis ⁽²⁹⁾. In other words, Neirynck makes it clear that, in the absence of any formal or necessary reason, one's source theory should influence one's choice of alternative configurations.

2. Depending on which is chosen, the synopsis editor must place a large number of pericopes in a particular configuration of the primary parallel order, covering material extending through approximately eight chapters in Matthew, three in Mark and three in Luke. This is clearly one of the most far-reaching of all "judgement calls" involved in setting up a synopsis.

3. The historian's understanding of the redactional activity of each Evangelist will vary drastically, depending on which synoptic arrangement he uses. Let us ask this question: How much of the confusion and disagreement in our current scholarship regarding the theological programmes of each of the Evangelists is due, at least in

⁽²⁸⁾ Ibid., 357. F. Neirynck's position paper at the Jerusalem Symposium on the Gospels dealt with this same cluster of pericopes at great length. However, readers may find his earlier article helpful; see "La rédaction matthéenne et la structure du premier évangile", *De Jésus aux Évangiles. Tradition et Rédaction dans les Évangiles synoptiques* (I. DE LA POTTERIE, ed.) (BETL 25 [1967] vol. II) 41-73.

⁽²⁹⁾ "The Sermon on the Mount", 356 f.

part, to a naive and uncritical reliance upon differently configured synopses (each claiming to be "objective")?

The first point is worthy of being repeated, since it bears most directly on the theme of our discussion: In the placement of the Sermon on the Mount vis-à-vis the order of Mark, there does not appear to be any necessary or intrinsic principle to guide the synopsis editor as he considers the alternatives and selects one way to display the primary order of parallel pericopes among the Synoptic Gospels. All he has is intuition, educated guessing and a pragmatic preference based on his favorite source theory.

In the Second Ampleforth Gospel Conference (1983), C. Tuckett addressed himself to the question of whether there was an "objective" method for identifying the common primary order of pericopes, and reached essentially the same conclusion that we have, but by a different route. He suggested that while one might be able to say objectively that certain pericopes were "in order", one could never find an objective way to say in what way certain pericopes were "out of order". The reason for this curious fact is because the original order must be known, in order to say which pericopes are "out of order" in the disarranged series. I propose that we call this "Tuckett's Dilemma" in honor of its discoverer.

How does one define a disagreement in order? An agreement in order is relatively easy to define: if two writers X and Y have two units of tradition, *a* and *b*, then if *a* precedes *b* in X and Y, there is agreement in order.

A disagreement is, at one level, a failure to agree, i.e., if one writer has *a b* and the other has *b a*. But can one be more precise beyond making the negative statement that there is a failure to agree? Suppose X and Y have four pericopes *a b c d* in the order X: *a b c d*, Y: *a c b d*. Clearly there is failure to agree in order. Further, most would assume that *a* and *d* are in the same order in the two texts. But which element, or elements, is or are, out of order? There are at least three ways of illustrating the parallels diagrammatically:

(i) X Y	(ii) X Y	(iii) X Y
<i>a a</i>	<i>a a</i>	<i>a a</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	<i>b c</i>
<i>c c</i>	<i>b b</i>	<i>c b</i>
<i>b</i>	<i>c</i>	
<i>d d</i>	<i>d d</i>	<i>d d</i>

According to (i) *b* is out of order; according to (ii) *c* is out of order; according to (iii) both *b* and *c* are out of order. At the purely formal level, there appears to be no way of claiming in absolute terms which of these three is

the preferable way of describing the pattern of agreement and disagreement in order between X and Y. Furthermore, the way in which the parallels are initially set up inevitably affects in a significant way the description of the differences of order. A different scheme of parallelisation produces a quite different set of non-parallels.⁽³⁰⁾

If we turn to the Gospels, we can find numerous examples of Tuckett's Dilemma.

(Table IV)

Which is the "objective" arrangement?

BENOIT

Matt 5-7 Sermon on Mount	Sermon on Plain Luke 6,20-49
Matt 10-11 Mission Discourse	
Matt 13 Parables	Parables Luke 8,5-16
	Mission Discourse Luke 9,1-6
Matt 18 Community Regulations	Community Regulations Luke 9,46-48
Matt 23 Woe to Pharisees	Woe to Pharisees Luke 20,45-47
Matt 24-25 Last Judgement	Last Judgement Luke 21

HUCK

Matt 5-7 Sermon on Mount	
Matt 10-11 Mission Instructions	
	Sermon on Plain Luke 6,20-49
Matt 13 Parables	Parables Luke 8,5-16
	Mission Discourse Luke 9,1-6
Matt 18 Community regulations	Community regulations Luke 9,46-48
Matt 23 Woe to Pharisees	Woe to Pharisees Luke 20,45-47
Matt 24-25 Last Judgement	Last Judgement Luke 21

ORCHARD

Matt 5-7 Sermon on the Mount	Sermon on the Plain Luke 6,20-49
	Parables Luke 8,5-16
Matt 10-11 Mission Discourse	Mission Discourse Luke 9,1-6
Matt 13 Parables	
Matt 18 Community regulations	Community regulations Luke 9,46-48
Matt 23 Woe to Pharisees	Woe to Pharisees Luke 20,45-47
Matt 24-25 Last Judgement	Last Judgement Luke 21

⁽³⁰⁾ See "Arguments from Order: Definition and Evaluation", in *Synoptic Studies. The Ampleforth Conferences of 1982 and 1983* (ed. C. M. TUCKETT) (Sheffield 1984) 198-199.

Dozens of examples of conflicting arrangements (clearly relying upon numerous unexplained "judgement calls") like the foregoing could be given from synopses now in print. It is quite beyond me why, despite our at least marginal awareness of this diversity, there is so little discussion about it. On the contrary, we seem to be in the grip of this smug but absolutely groundless conviction that our synopses are "objective"!

I suggest that it is not possible to decide a single one of these choices without explicit or implicit appeal to some kind of synoptic source hypothesis. What is the synopsis editor doing, if not seeking to recapitulate the original, historical web of multiple relationships among the Gospel pericopes? — in other words, arrive at some sort of source hypothesis? It is almost the same task as that undertaken by someone writing a redactional analysis of the evangelists' compositional activity.

The great problem is: which *chain of pericopes* will he create, running throughout the length of the Gospels? What *series* of pericopes will he match up, in the full knowledge that if he puts them one way, he will have to forego other possible points of common linkage? This is no longer the elementary question of keeping each Gospel's order intact throughout the synopsis. This is a very different question: what common *order* or chain of pericopes among all three (or four) Gospels will he decide upon? A lot hangs on this decision. For example, someone may use his common order as evidence for the existence of the pre-redactional Ur-Gospel. Someone else will use the common order he composes as evidence for the stages of composition of the Gospels. A third person will look at his common order of pericopes and see evidence of dynamic theological trends in the early Church. There are a number of ultra-sensitive questions which hang in the balance as the Synopsis editor works his way through the Gospel narratives, arbitrarily deciding which pericopes to put next to each other in some sort of continuous chain. At the very least, he will be laying down what is widely regarded as the fundamental evidence for any source hypothesis.

These considerations prompt me to make the following observation: all of the major synopses published so far — and certainly the three or four most popular today — were constructed by text critics and philologists, not historians, much less theologians. Could this be one of our great flaws in methodology? This task is too theological to leave to text critics and philologists. They treat the Gospels

like a giant puzzle, cutting up the narratives into tiny bits and pieces and putting them here and there, with a deaf ear to the theological harmonies they are destroying. Perhaps the way to proceed would be to prepare a preliminary redactional analysis of each Gospel independently *before* beginning the task of dividing up the narratives. Then these redactional studies could be used as a guide to determine which paragraphs to place next to each other. They could eventually become mini-commentaries explaining the "judgement calls" made along the way, and published as a companion to the finished synopsis.

Of course, no one would then dare to claim that any of it represented neutral, objective, absolute Truth. Each synopsis so constructed would have printed pericopes next to each other on the basis of an *assumed* original common order of parallel pericopes. The grounds for this assumption would be stated in the Preface, and they would, of course, be multiple: theological, literary, historical, intuitive⁽³¹⁾.

(³¹) In this respect, R. J. SWANSON, *The Horizontal Line Synopsis of the Gospels* (Dillsboro, NC 1975), avoids the whole problem by the expedient of printing each Gospel successively as the "lead Gospel" in separate parts of the Synopsis (or now in separate volumes). In this arrangement, the text of the "lead Gospel" is printed in order at the top of each cluster of parallel lines, and the other Gospels are disarranged to fit it. The same applies to the forthcoming synopsis edited by Robert Funk.

Of course, these problems have long been recognized. Up until recently, it has been customary simply to rearrange the text according to some preconceived order (Gospel harmonies). Griesbach's own synopsis, which is the first attempt to avoid rearranging each Gospel while at the same time parallelizing as many pericopes as possible, did not succeed in attracting many adherents. His own student De Wette abandoned his master's synoptic arrangement, and published a revision that was a poor compromise. It keeps to a unified, Griesbachian order for the early pericopes (John the Baptist, the Baptism of Jesus, and the Temptation) and then adopts a serial presentation for the "Galilean Ministry". When the Passion narrative commences, it resumes a common primary order. See the *Tabula Argumentorum in Synopsis evangeliorum . . . ex recensione Griesbachii* (Berlin ²1818) vi-x.

This complex tangle of parallels in the early part of the Gospels may have prompted Lagrange to cut the Gordian knot by assimilating the texts of Matthew and Mark to the order of Luke, offering nothing more to justify this astonishing procedure than the patently flimsy excuse that Luke was the one Evangelist who explicitly claimed to have composed his narrative ἀκριβῶς

It appears that we must contend with something akin to Heisenberg's "principle of indeterminacy" here. As everyone knows, Werner Heisenberg (and others) proved that in the realm of subatomic phenomena, it is impossible to study infinitesimally small phenomena without disturbing them by the very act of observation. Every experiment produces the evidence which is examined by that experiment; the resulting hypotheses are therefore simply the arbitrary constructs produced by those experiments. Fully aware of this circularity in its methods, modern physics avoids terms like "laws of nature", and speaks instead of "quanta" that are known to be "statistically probable". Similarly, it is impossible to study the Synoptic phenomena without making synoptic charts and columns — arranged according to one's source theory — which deploy the evidence in such a way that one can see the evidence for one's synoptic theory. Then one proceeds to make better, newer synopses (based on one's source theory), etc. etc. etc. It is like the *circulus in probando* described above with regard to text criticism. In short, all of our scholarship is essentially an exercise in circular reasoning, and "the objective facts" are forever indeterminable in any direct sense. Hence, the analogy with Heisenberg's "principle of indeterminacy".

In summary, the best policy would be for synopsis editors to state explicitly what assumptions have guided them as they constructed their synopses. "Judgement calls" should be indentified as such and discussed, whether in the preface or in a separate publication. Since a source theory is as indispensable for constructing the text as it is for constructing the synopsis, the best policy would be to openly use a single theory rigorously and consistently throughout, rather than to muddle along in a random and confused manner pretending not to use any (which is one of the many reasons why I say

καθεξῆς (see M. J. LAGRANGE and C. LAVERGNE, *Synopsis Evangelica* [Paris 1926] x).

There is manifold evidence that the ancient fathers also struggled with this part of the Gospels. The common solution then seems to have been to use Matthew (or Matthew plus John = the two apostles among the Evangelists) as the "bedrock" order of pericopes and assimilate the other Gospels to it (e.g., the Ammonian Canons, the Eusebian Canons, Tatian's Diatessaron, and the detailed harmony in Books II and III of AUGUSTINE'S *De consensu evangelistarum*).

Aland and Huck are at present among the least serviceable of synopses).

3. *The division into pericopes cannot be "neutral"*

I mentioned above that our two most widely used "neutral" synopses differed about 30% from each other with respect to the total number and size of pericopes. Although scholars tend to be irritated by Aland's excessive atomization of the text, they simply turn to Huck-Lietzmann (or now Greeven) for a slightly different arrangement — or they just use the Nestle-Aland text and make up their own pericopes.

Few realize that the question of the division into pericopes is a third area fraught with complications and paradoxes so far-reaching that it is my impression that both Huck-Greeven and Aland are really useful for little more than text critical study.

Touching on this in my previous essay⁽³²⁾, I did not bring out sufficiently there the specific way in which a task as seemingly innocent as dividing the text into pericopes has an enormous impact on how one visually perceives the Synoptic Problem. Perhaps I may give an illustration.

At the present time, there is confusion as to whether pericopes should represent divisions the evangelists themselves made in their narratives and sources⁽³³⁾, or whether the pericopes should be the

⁽³²⁾ "Theory", 321ff.

⁽³³⁾ An unusually clear statement of this approach is to be found in the *Harmony* of STEVENS and BURTON. In an Appendix entitled "Principles and Methods with Which the Harmony is Constructed" they say: "[We have followed] the general principle of preserving as far as possible the structure of each gospel [because] it is important that the gospel history should be read by paragraphs, not by verses... [This] has led us to abandon the plan adopted by those harmonies which make it a matter of chief importance that similar sentences or even phrases stand opposite one another on the page. This plan involves infinite *dissection* in the gospel narratives... [Thus we have] contented ourselves with placing parallel *paragraphs* opposite one another, leaving it to the student to make the more detailed comparison himself. This method is the more necessary because there are so many different kinds of parallelism... This arises from the fact that the various writers differ widely in style and in their method of narration. *No printed page can adequately exhibit the exact character of the parallelism between*

tiny fragments they received from oral tradition, according to the assumptions of Form Criticism. The best example of the latter position is the synopsis published by W. E. Bundy in 1932. He commented on this important problem in his introduction:

... There will also be a difference of opinion with regard to the division into paragraphs. [My divisions] are much briefer and more than twice as numerous as is usual in [other synopses]... . In general, each paragraph represents a piece of tradition concerning Jesus that came down to the Synoptic writers in oral or written form... . The division into paragraphs, then, is an attempt to get back as near as possible to the primitive pieces of tradition concerning Jesus from which our first three Gospels were derived and composed... . We now recognize the fact that our Gospel accounts of Jesus are at best fragmentary and chaotic... [he then lists types of tradition: conflicts, wonder works, sayings, parables, etc. and concludes:] This most recent line of quest in the life-of-Jesus research (Formgeschichte) is yielding desirable results relative to the pre-Gospel state of the earliest Christian story of Jesus, and it is fundamental in synopsis-making.⁽³⁴⁾

Bundy accordingly came up with no less than 465 pericopes (saying that he could have subdivided some of them still further). This is the highest number for any Two-Document Hypothesis synopsis ever published (he also explicitly oriented his arrangement of pericopes according to that theory). It is not the most atomistically divided synopsis ever published, however. A. Wright's complex oral theory led him to publish a synopsis (1896 – 1st ed.) in which the Gospels are grouped and regrouped in more than 800 pericopes.

However, scholars have long known about these variations in pericope size among the various synopses without taking them very seriously. The first sign that there might be more than met the eye here was the publication of W. R. Farmer's *Synopticon* (Cambridge 1969), in which he sought to display parallelism of wording *without* divisions into pericopes typical of synopses. The only divisions he used were the paragraphs of the Nestle 25th text⁽³⁵⁾. The intention

paragraphs of dissimilar scope and structure." (emphasis added on last sentence); W. A. STEVENS and E. D. BURTON, *A Harmony of the Gospels for Historical Study. An Analytical Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (New York 1905) 252; see further 249ff. Cp. the statements of ORCHARD, *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in Greek*, xv.

⁽³⁴⁾ W. E. BUNDY, *A Syllabus and Synopsis of the First Three Gospels* (Indianapolis 1932) 13-14.

⁽³⁵⁾ See W. R. FARMER, *Synopticon. The Verbal Agreement between the*

was to focus strictly upon the phenomena of parallelism without getting entangled in the confusing phenomenon of differing pericope sizes among the several Gospels. Few have grasped the value of this instrument, however, and it is still rarely used.

Then in 1978 E. P. Sanders drew attention to a curious and little-noticed fact: the way one perceived the evidence bearing on the Synoptic Problem, in particular the traditional argument from order of pericopes, varied according to whether one used a synopsis having large or one having small pericopes.

The [traditional] argument from order deals only with full pericopes, and further, with full pericopes as they are presented in Tischendorf's synopsis. The restriction of the question to *full pericopes* was quite reasonable when the goal of research was to find a biographical outline of Jesus' life to substitute for the Johannine outline, confidence in which had been destroyed by Strauss. Naturally, only the *main events* were significant. Whenever two gospels agreed in the placement of a pericope, their agreement was attributed to faithful copying of the Ur-gospel. . . . But once the question becomes the *strictly literary* one of whether there was some contact between Matthew and Luke, it is clear that the limitation [of the argument] to full [event-oriented] pericopes is unwarranted. . . . Tischendorf's pericopes are longer than those in Huck, his successor. . . . Instances in which neither Matthew nor Luke supports Mark's order were overlooked [by Woods, Hawkins, et al.] because they were not [set out as] independent pericopes in Tischendorf's synopsis, as they had been in Huck's.⁽³⁶⁾

The distinction Sanders is drawing here needs to be clearly grasped. In the 19th century and before, he says, the goal was to construct harmonies of the Gospels whose divisions documented successive episodes in the life and ministry of Jesus. Thus, they tended to have large, "anecdote-sized," or event-sized pericopes. Further-

Greek Texts of Matthew, Mark and Luke Contextually Exhibited (Cambridge 1969) second page of the Introduction. In some ways, it would make sense to use Swanson's *Horizontal Line Synopsis* in tandem with Farmer's *Synopticon*, to verify the use of colors in the latter with the actual parallel texts printed in the former. Swanson's Greek synopsis also has an excellent, new apparatus with the unusual feature of full citation *in parallelism*, so that the eye can immediately perceive the variant readings. In this way, one is able to pursue the Synoptic Problem on down into the history of the texts of the Gospels.

⁽³⁶⁾ E. P. SANDERS, "The Argument from Order and the Relationship between Matthew and Luke", *NTS* 15 (1969) 252f.

more, it was thought that these anecdotes were handed down in the oral tradition to the Evangelists (who, in the case of Matthew and John, were eye-witnesses of the same events themselves), and that they more or less smoothly combined these anecdotes into full-length narratives. Huck's synopsis was different in that it had its origin as the display mechanism for a complicated literary hypothesis involving two stages of Mark's composition, a Logia source, and so on. The result was that Huck broke the narratives and anecdotes up into numerous tiny elements, and displayed their agreement and disagreement, in a way that had never been done before.

How did Huck's *Synopsis* affect the debate over the Synoptic Problem? The answer is as strange as it is simple. In fact, we are dealing with something so elementary that no one, with the single exception of E. P. Sanders, has even noticed it. He saw how it drastically affected one of the pillar arguments of the whole debate: the argument from the order of pericopes. Let me explain.

The observation regarding the alternating support in order of pericopes between Matthew, Mark and Luke, was the keystone of the theory of J. J. Griesbach. He probably did not invent this argument himself, but found it in the work of such contemporaries as the English scholar, Henry Owen⁽³⁷⁾, or Anton Friedrich Büsching⁽³⁸⁾. Shortly after the publication of his hypothesis, however, this observation became the object of intense debate. Eventually, after extensive reformulation by a number of French, German and English scholars⁽³⁹⁾, it emerged upside down, as it were, due to a serious procedural error that was mainly caused by Christian Hermann Weisse⁽⁴⁰⁾. This procedural error then passed on undetected into the

(37) See Henry OWEN, *Observations on the Four Gospels* (London 1764).

(38) See Anton Friedrich BÜSCHING, *Die vier Evangelisten mit ihren eigenen Worten zusammengesetzt und mit Erklärungen versehen* (Hamburg 1766).

(39) For the history of this period, see especially H.-H. STOLDT, *Geschichte und Kritik der Markushypothese* (Göttingen 1977); Engl. transl. by D. L. NIEWYK, *History and Criticism of the Marcan Hypothesis* (1980). The E.T. has an additional foreword by W. R. Farmer and a very informative Appendix by C. E. Wolfe listing 180 "minor agreements against Mark" together with text critical notes.

(40) This procedural error was first noted by B. C. BUTLER in *The Originality of St. Matthew. A Critique of the Two-Document Hypothesis* (Cambridge 1951) in a chapter entitled "The Lachmann Fallacy". For a fuller discussion, see STOLDT, *Geschichte*, 47-68.

scholarly discussion on both sides of the Channel, appearing most notably in the definitive treatment of the Synoptic Problem by B. H. Streeter (1924), where it can be found as the third "reason" for accepting the priority of Mark⁽⁴¹⁾ — the exact opposite of Griesbach's conclusion!

How could this strange reversal take place? Although a number of explanations have been put forward which take into account the climate of opinion prevailing at the time, which for various theological and political reasons *wanted* Mark to have been written first rather than Matthew, there is another feature of the post-Griesbach discussion that was at least as devastating as the theological war against David Friedrich Strauss and the Tübingen School, and much more subtle. This is the phenomenon which has been drawn to our attention by E. P. Sanders: the customary statement of the argument from order of pericopes made sense to him if he used Tischendorf's synopsis to examine the evidence for it, but that it didn't if he used Huck. What a strange situation! Which synopsis should he use?

What if Griesbach's statement regarding the order of pericopes, namely, the alternating support he observed between Mark and the other two Synoptic Gospels, became meaningless because scholars began to use other synopses in which (a) the Gospel narratives were divided differently, and (b) the common order of parallel pericopes was differently arranged? Wouldn't it be inevitable that the phenomenon Griesbach thought he saw would simply disappear? Of course! In point of fact, his "discovery" was literally buried beneath an avalanche of alternative synoptic charts, diagrams and synopses. Holtzmann's encouragement of Albert Huck to produce a synopsis that fit *his* theory was not only prudent, it was absolutely necessary, if he wanted others to see what he saw in the texts.

What was Griesbach's statement regarding the alternating support in order of pericopes among the Synoptic Gospels? Perhaps it won't hurt to repeat his original statement of it:

Mark compiled his whole work (apart from about twenty-four verses which he added from his own sources...) from the works of Matthew and Luke in such a manner that

⁽⁴¹⁾ B. H. STREETER, *The Four Gospels* (New York 1924) 151, see also 161f.

- (A) it can be easily shown what he took from the one and what he took from the other;
- (B) he retained the order observed by Matthew in such a way, that wherever he forsakes it he sticks to the path of Luke and follows him and the order of his narrative step by step, to such an extent that
- (C) the verses and words where he passes from Matthew to Luke or returns from Luke to Matthew can not only be pointed out, but also
- (D) the probable reason can generally be given why at a given time he deserted Matthew (though he had set himself to use him as his chief guide) and attached himself to Luke, and why putting Luke away he once more attached himself to Matthew; and further
- (E) it can also be understood why, precisely in *this* passage of Matthew and not in another, he again connects up the thread which he had previously broken by passing over to Luke⁽⁴²⁾.

Then Griesbach added a table, saying

You can see with your own eyes [in the following chart] Mark having the volumes of Matthew and Luke at hand, continually consulting each, extracting from each whatever he thought would most benefit his readers, now laying aside Matthew, now Luke for a little while, but always returning to the very same place of either one where he had begun to diverge from him.⁽⁴³⁾

And this is Griesbach's chart (omitting the explanatory notes).

Griesbach's chart

MATT	MARK	LUKE
[Cap. 1 et 2.]	—	
3,1 - 4,22.	← 1,1-20.	
	1,21-39.	→ 4,31-44.
	—	[5,1-11.]
	1,40 - 3,6.	5,12 - 6,11.
12,15.16.	← 3,7-12.	
[12,17-21]	—	
	3,13-19.	→ 6,12-16.
12,22.23.	← 3,20.21.	
12,24-32.	3,22-30.	
[12,33-37.]	—	
[12,38-45.]	—	
12,46-50.	3,31-35.	
13,1-23.	4,1-20.	

⁽⁴²⁾ See J. B. ORCHARD and T. R. W. LONGSTAFF, eds, *J. J. Griesbach: Synoptic and Text-Critical Studies 1776 - 1976* (Cambridge 1978) 108.

⁽⁴³⁾ *Ibid.*

	4,21-25.	→ 8,16-18.
[13,24-30.]	← 4,26-29.	
13,31.32.	4,30-32.	
13,34.35.	4,33.34.	
	—	[8,19-21.]
	4,35-41.	→ 8,22-25.
	5,1-43.	8,26-56.
13,53-58.	← 6,1-6.	
	6,7-13.	→ 9,1-6.
14,1-2.	6,14-16.	9,7-9.
14,3-12.	← 6,17-29.	
	6,30.31.	→ 9,10.
14,13-21.	← 6,32-44.	→ 9,11-17.
14,22 - 16,12.	← 6,45 - 8,21.	
—	8,22-26.	
16,13 - 18,9.	← 8,27 - 9,50.	→ 9,18-51.
[18,10-35.]	—	
	—	[9,51 - 18,14.]
19,1-12.	← 10,1-12.	
19,13 - 23,1.	← 10,13 - 12,38.	→ 18,15 - 20,45.
[23,1-39.]	—	
	12,38-44.	→ 20,45 - 21,4.
24,1-36.	← 13,1-32.	→ 21,5. sqq.
[24,37 - 25,46.]	← 13,33-36.	
26,1 - 28,8.	14,1 - 16,8.	
	16,9.	
[28,9-15.]	—	
[28,16.17.]	—	
	16,10-13.	→ 24,10-35.
	16,14.	24,36-43.
28,18-20.	← 16,15-18.	
	16,19.	→ 24,50.51.
	16,20.	

Note how large the pericope divisions are in this chart — whole stories, or even chains of stories in each division. I have added the arrows to indicate when Mark moved from one text to the other, taking what he wanted there, and then always coming back and resuming the narrative in the first Gospel at the very spot he left when he went across to the other. It is quite remarkable, once one has actually seen this simple and purposeful pattern.

Now look at the *Parallelenregister* in any edition of Huck and see if this pattern can be seen. Virtually impossible. The whole visual impact of Huck's *Parallelenregister* is too complicated and filled with minutiae. But the real reason why it is impossible to use Huck's synopsis to verify Griesbach's observation is because he

sliced up the anecdotes and then set up the common order of parallel pericopes in a radically different arrangement than Griesbach used in his Chart (see Tables II and III above, pp. 467, 469). Huck's arrangement makes it virtually impossible to understand Mark's use of his two *Vorlagen* if one assumes Griesbach's theory of the order of composition. But equally as important, Huck's much smaller pericope divisions completely obscure the methodical process Griesbach thought he detected in Mark's artful combination of his two source documents, destroying completely all traces of Mark's simple, step-wise procedure. Instead, looking at Huck⁽⁴⁴⁾, one is compelled to envision Mark darting rapidly back and forth between the texts Matthew and Luke, "like a fly in a bottle" (as one scholar derisively put it), picking up certain words and phrases and skipping over others for no apparent reason. It's no wonder. Huck's synopsis was never designed to lay out the evidence that Mark was written *last*. It was designed to exhibit the evidence for Holtzmann's theory of the independent use of Mark (and a Logia source) by Matthew and Luke. Huck explains this in the very first sentences of the Preface to his first edition (1892):

Vorliegende 'Synopsis der ersten Evangelien' erhebt keinen Anspruch auf selbständige, wissenschaftliche Bedeutung. Sie will in erster Linie nur eine Ergänzung zu dem betreffenden Commentar von Holtzmann . . . bilden und das Studium dieses Buches erleichtern. Dem entsprechend ist die ganze Einrichtung getroffen . . . auch bezüglich der Eintheilung der Perikopen weicht die Synopsis nur an 3 Stellen etwas vom HC. an.⁽⁴⁵⁾

So the pericope divisions in Huck's first edition are strictly based upon Holtzmann's first edition of his *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament* (vol. I, 1889; 2nd ed., 1892). What that means is that the narratives of both Matthew and Luke were divided up strictly according to (a) the parallel in Mark, or (b) according to a presumed Logia source, or (c) according to other presumed sources. Further-

(44) Huck's layout in the Parallelenregister (pp. vi-x) of his first edition is identical to the one given by Holtzmann in his *Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament* Bd. I Synoptiker (Freiburg i.B. 1889) 10-12. In an appended statement at the end of Huck's Vorwort, Holtzmann said that he, in turn, had found the synopses of Schulze (1861 and 1886 [2te Aufl.]) and Sevin (1866) exceptionally useful. Why them and not Tischendorf?

(45) Albert HUCK, *Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien* (Freiburg 1892) v.

more, the order of pericopes in Matthew and Luke were *disarranged* so that they conformed to Mark's order.

But then, in one of those ironic twists of academic fate, not long after Huck had published his companion synopsis, Holtzmann changed his mind. Immediately, Huck's first (and second) editions were obsolete. Tiring of this unpredictable situation, Huck struck out on his own, and in his 3rd edition, claimed that his synopsis was "neutral" with regard to any source theory. But it is obvious that he did not create his third edition *ab initio*. He merely moved Mark into the middle column, kept the very small pericope divisions he had inherited from Holtzmann, and instituted a sort of wobbling primary order of pericopes, alternating between having Matthew's and Luke's pericopes follow the order of Mark's (one blatant case of disarrangement left over from his Holtzmann days we noted above). Otherwise, he matched up the Q pericopes.

The stark deficiencies of Huck's synopsis would have been felt sooner, if it had not been for the fact that all these things came to pass precisely during the heyday of the theory of Markan priority. For numerous theological and political reasons already discussed elsewhere, this hypothesis was swiftly gaining in popularity, both in England and Germany; naturally America followed suit. Huck's synopsis came to be preferred to Tischendorf's because it fitted right into this movement — even lending the hypothesis of Markan priority an aura of "scientific objectivity" with its claim of "neutrality" regarding its arrangement. Indeed, Huck's tiny pericope divisions even fitted in perfectly with that subsequent German pastime, "Form Criticism". All things considered, "Huck" has been a phenomenally successful synopsis.

I beg the reader's forgiveness for such a lengthy digression into past history, but it seemed necessary in order to grasp the significance of E. P. Sanders' observation regarding the relationship between the synopsis one uses, and one's perception of the argument from order.

What is the moral of our story? Simply this: we must get in the habit of citing the synopsis we are using whenever we make any claims with respect to the evidence regarding the order of pericopes — or any other aspect of the Synoptic Problem. Different synopses exhibit different evidence.

Conclusion to Part A.

These three lines of argument, dealing with the text, with arrangement of pericopes in primary common order, and with division into pericopes, all point to one and the same conclusion: a synopsis that is "neutral" with respect to the Synoptic Problem is impossible. We have not realized this heretofore, and as a result, the scholarly community has been caught, literally for centuries, in a "war of the synopses" which has been extraordinarily confusing. The deleterious impact on Gospel scholarship has been enormous: a stunted and distorted conception of the earliest Gospel tradition⁽⁴⁶⁾; universal use of a single critical text of the New Testament that a disturbing number of text-critics find quite unsatisfactory⁽⁴⁷⁾; and a conception of the literary methods of the evangelists that is strikingly out of touch with the realities of the early Church and the world it inhabited⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Wouldn't it be better to have synopses that were specifically designed to help us with the problems we are working on? Instead of "general purpose" synopses that cannot be used very well for any-

⁽⁴⁶⁾ B. GERHARDSSON, *Memory and Manuscript* (Lund 1966) remains the most important research in this problem area, although B. Reicke has also recently published a major contribution. Furthermore, this whole subject will receive some long overdue attention, if the plans made at the conclusion of the Jerusalem Symposium on the Interrelationship of the Gospels are successfully followed. The next such conference is to be on the subject: "The Gospel Tradition before, in, and beside the Gospels".

⁽⁴⁷⁾ See for example the observations of EPP, "Eclectic Method", 211-257; and, IDEM, "A Continuing Interlude in New Testament Textual Criticism?", *HTR* 73 (1980) 131-151.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ A striking feature of the scholarly situation with respect to the whole question of the compositional methods employed by the Evangelists is the comparatively immobilized German and French discussion (the former apparently still mesmerized by the utterly outdated monograph by K. L. SCHMIDT, *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* [Berlin 1919]), as compared with the Anglo-Saxon. In the latter case, out of a vigorous discussion, the following studies might be mentioned: H. CADBURY, *The Making of Luke-Acts* (New York 1927; repr. London 1961); M. HADAS and M. SMITH, *Heroes and Gods, Spiritual Biographies in Antiquity* (New York 1965); C. H. TALBERT, *Literary Patterns, Theological Themes and the Genre of Luke-Acts* (Missoula 1977); and P. SHULER, *A Genre for the Gospels. The Biographical Character of Matthew* (Philadelphia 1982).

thing, wouldn't it be preferable to have new synopses that were especially created to assist our research in the three major areas in Gospel research? Perhaps I may give some examples of the new designs we need.

B. Synopses of the Future

In view of the foregoing argument, it seems best to give up the illusion that our synopses can be neutral with respect to the Synoptic Problem. Better to recognize that inevitable fact and instead to design synopses that will assume *different* synoptic theories in order to compare the results. In order to accomplish this, it seems wise, to begin with, to stop trying to construct "multi-purpose" synopses, such as we have at present. Precisely by trying to do all tasks, they succeed in doing none very well.

Perhaps we could adopt as the fundamental principle of our new generation of synopses: "form must follow function". This approach has the virtue of focusing our attention at the outset on the primary task for which we intend to use each synopsis. With this clearly in mind, we can design and redesign the synopsis in any way we wish until we have one that will do exactly what we want it to.

I see three basic functions or purposes for which synopses are needed. There may be more than three, but, if so, I am not aware of them. They are the following (these are not arranged in any particular order):

- (A) study of the text
- (B) study of the pre-Gospel tradition
- (C) study of the final, written composition.

For convenience' sake, let us call these Type A, Type B, and Type C synopses, respectively.

Type A Synopses – for use in Text-Criticism

Function: The function of these synopses will be to assist in reconstructing the *autograph* version(s) of each Gospel. This endeavor, however, will proceed in full awareness of the probability

that there may never have been *one* original autograph copy, that instead a number of slightly different "original" copies may have been composed orally or in writing by the same author (or his school) over a period of time. By recognizing at the outset that "publishing" in the modern sense of the term, whereby we refer to the production of a fixed, printed text, is almost totally inappropriate as a model for understanding the "publishing" of the Gospels in the much more fluid conditions of the oral-culture of that day, these synopses would strive to reproduce visually the "dynamic text" situation of the original version(s) of the Gospels.

Form: To be fully useful, such a synopsis must be arranged in a meticulous word by word, space for space, line by line correlation. Whether they are arranged in vertical or horizontal columns is a matter of preference. R. Swanson's *Horizontal Line Synopsis* is remarkably easier to use for this sort of detailed comparison, it seems to me. On the other hand, since the vertical column synopses are so familiar, many will continue to prefer them. Of course, these synopses will require a full apparatus and extensive patristic citations, quotations from apocryphal sources, and so on.

Best examples at present: Aland and Greeven are already close to the ideal in all of the above respects. Swanson is particularly easy for minute comparison.

Relation to the Synoptic Problem: It would be interesting to use different source theories to establish different critical texts, in order to see how much difference there would actually be between them, as to the text itself. It might turn out that, after such an experiment, the difference between several such "alternative texts" would be negligible (viz., slightly more than the margin of error of any reconstructed text). Then we really would be in a position to speak of a verified *text* of the Gospels that was "neutral" with respect to the Synoptic Problem!

Type B Synopses — for use in the study of the pre-Gospel oral tradition

Function: The chief purpose of these synopses will be to help us focus on the pre-redactional period of the Gospel tradition. At present, there are no synopses strictly dedicated to that task. However, one scholar in particular has pioneered in this area. M.-E. Bois-

mard's analyses, in volumes II and III of the *Synopse des quatre Évangiles*, contain, for each pericope, a detailed history of its tradition, from earliest form to latest, accompanied by synoptic charts and diagrams — drawing on a wide range of patristic citations, apocryphal writings, and manuscript readings. Each of these “mini-synopses” reveals his understanding of the historical sequence of the pre-(or post-) redactional Gospel tradition.

The difficulty of such an endeavor must not be underestimated. It is clear, for example, that Boismard has consistently sought to reconstruct the oral (or written) history of each sayings tradition or narrative pericope, many times down into the third or fourth century, solely on the basis of the evidence. That is, he has been wise enough to avoid the Nestle text. How many Gospel scholars have the training to undertake this sort of fundamental reconstruction of the history of the tradition? Instead, the rest of us think we can deal with the pre-redactional, oral period using the Nestle–Aland text. But this procedure is obviously doomed to failure, since so much important evidence has long since been thrown away by generations of text critics, or if it is there it is to be found in the cryptic footnotes, tiny shards and slivers of alternative readings. Never do we look up the full text of the alternative traditions, so that we might be in a position to perceive any complete alternative *patterns*, within which the variant word or punctuation might take on real meaning. The result is that we publish a lot of nonsense about the oral tradition.

We must look at the actual ancient traditions in their wholeness if we really want to examine scientifically the pre-compositional Gospel tradition. We must read the actual text of Vaticanus or Sinaiticus, the Syriac versions, actual quotations of Epiphanius or Irenaeus in their contexts if we hope to reconstruct the earliest stages of the Gospel tradition. In fact, this new focus on the oral tradition may throw some light on the problems plaguing text critics today, floundering as they are in a morass of confusion (baptized as a method and called “eclecticism”) following the collapse of the Westcott-Hort text-type theories. If we can discern early tendencies in the oral-tradition period, we may find that they link up with similar tendencies in the post-redactional period, when the Gospels were being copied or cited in different ways, presumably in the same centers that produced them.

Form: Taking Boismard's work as a guide, we need a new syn-

opsis format. As a "Synopsis of the Oral Tradition", it would be divided up according to specific pericopes or stories in their pre-redactional form, as they were presumably handed down in the oral tradition. Each Gospel pericope would be displayed in isolation, using vertical columns for purposes of minute comparison. The earliest version would be printed in the far left column, then the next oldest and the next, proceeding across the page to the most recent. Included with the charts (at the bottom of the page) would be comments on the successive versions, so that discussion and evidence would be seen together.

The material might be arranged in divisions according to Form Critical rubrics, such as:

- | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| - parables | - with parallels from |
| - healing stories | Jewish, Greek, and |
| - apophthegmata | Roman materials |
| - apocalypses | |
| - laws, etc., etc. | |

Best examples at present: With the exception of Boismard, there are no adequate examples of this type of synopsis in print at present. Even the case of Boismard is confusing, since his "mini-synopses" bear no noticeable relation to the same pericopes in the Synopsis in Vol. I, which was independently prepared by P. Benoit.

There is one earlier example of an oral-tradition synopsis. The Synopsis of Arthur Wright (1903) is a superb creation exhibiting remarkable attention to minute variations in textual detail. Since he assumed the Oral Hypothesis, he made full use of textual variants, displaying these in a very sophisticated page layout.

Relation to the Synoptic Problem: The central function of this synopsis would be to facilitate Form Critical study of the Gospel tradition during its oral period. In particular, it would help scholars deal with the problem of dating different versions of a story or saying. To this end, it would seek to identify reliable indicators of early or late tradition. The indicators commonly used now are: the presence of semitisms, longer or shorter version of the story or saying, clear or broken form, poor or good Greek, etc. These have each come under heavy attack⁽⁴⁹⁾, and at present there is little agree-

⁽⁴⁹⁾ See on this whole subject, E. P. SANDERS, *Tendencies of the Synoptic Tradition* (NTS Monograph Series 9; Cambridge 1969).

ment as to whether there are any reliable indicators of the earliness or lateness of a tradition. For this reason, a research tool such as this would be especially useful to scholars working on the Synoptic Problem, since judgements respecting early and late forms of traditions are unavoidable.

Type C Synopses — for use in studying the literary composition of the Gospels

Function: These synopses will be specifically designed to aid in analysis of the literary composition of the Gospels. However, they will be so constructed as to highlight the likelihood that the Evangelists did not each use the same methods when composing their narratives. This feature would set these synopses apart from all existing or previously published synopses. These would be the first to emphasize rather than conceal the different habits and strategies of composition adopted by each Evangelist.

As such, these synopses will also be intended to reveal each Evangelist's major, distinctive theological concerns, precisely as revealed by the way he arranges and augments his source material. This might be considered a synopsis specifically designed for the theologian or historian to use, i.e., for those who want a more nuanced and concrete historical theology of the New Testament. A synopsis of this type would facilitate understanding of the distinctive ways each Evangelist made use of the Jesus tradition, as compared with Paul, the authors of the Pastorals, 1 Peter, Hebrews, etc.

Form: The pericope divisions would be according to the "stories" (individual units) and "chapters" (groups of units) as understood or intended by the Gospel authors themselves. The common order of parallel pericopes would be set up explicitly using a particular source theory, and would take one "lead Gospel" at a time as the focus of study in successive parts of the synopsis.

In addition, there would be some sort of commentary explaining the Evangelist's supposed compositional activity, located at the bottom of each page. As part of this, comparative notes or references to similar compositional procedures from the Greco-Roman and Jewish world would be helpful (cp. Wettstein). There would also be a minimal textual apparatus that mentioned only the most important

variant readings. The introduction would spell out the source theory guiding the construction and arrangement of the whole synopsis.

These detailed synopses need to be supplemented by large wall charts of the type published by J. Barr, *Chart of Synoptic Relationships*. These large, multi-columned, multi-color charts enable one to see the whole pattern of the interrelations among the Evangelists, providing a valuable "bird's eye view" of the whole "forest". Sometimes this is lost sight of as one labors down among the individual "trees" in the Synoptic Problem.

Relation to the Synoptic Problem: these synopses would in fact represent full-scale demonstrations of one particular solution to the Synoptic Problem. That is, each synopsis of this sort would be a complete redactional, theological analysis of the Gospel-creating activity of each Evangelist, according to one particular source hypothesis... the ultimate test of its *Brauchbarkeit*. Naturally, one would expect the number of such synopses to equal the number of competing hypotheses that there are in the field today⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Best examples at present: As noted, there are no really good examples of this sort of synopsis available at the moment. There are good examples of aspects of one, however. For example, I might mention P. Vanutelli's usually overlooked writings which contain superb comparative charts for elucidating the Gospel compositional activity.

F. W. Beare's *Companion* has the sort of brief compositional-theological glosses that I have in mind. Orchard has an excellent Introduction (to the Greek synopsis) that spells out the source theory that guided his synopsis construction; see also the introductions of W. A. Stevens - E. D. Burton, and Sparks⁽⁵¹⁾.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ It was unanimously agreed by the participants at the Jerusalem Symposium on the Interrelations among the Gospels, that this "holistic" treatment was the only really decisive test of any hypothesis.

⁽⁵¹⁾ See, among many useful works by VANUTELLI, *Gli Evangelii in Sinossi. Nuovo Studio del Problema Sinottico* (Torino-Roma 1931). Further, F. W. BEARE, *The Earliest Records of Jesus. A Companion to the Synopsis of the First Three Gospels by Albert Huck* (Nashville 1962). For the English version of Orchard's synopsis, see *A Synopsis of the Four Gospels in a New Translation Arranged According to the Two-Gospel Hypothesis* (1982); the Greek text was subsequently published by T. & T. Clark, Ltd., Edinburgh, 1983. As the Greek edition was intended for scholars, it is in the Preface to this synopsis that Orchard most fully spelled out his new thinking on synop-

Conclusion

It may be that others will envision still other types of synopses that would be useful for studying major problem-areas of the Gospels, but until we break free from the prison of our existing synopses, we will continue to stumble painfully down the road, hobbled by poorly designed instruments, and making very little progress in these three great areas of research: text criticism, form criticism and redaction criticism.

The University of Tennessee
Department of Religious Studies
Knoxville TN 37996

David L. DUNGAN

SOMMAIRE

La supposition courante d'après laquelle nos deux synopses les plus largement utilisées (Aland, Huck-Lietzmann) sont «neutres» par rapport au problème synoptique n'est pas fondée. Cette étude avance trois sortes de preuves pour montrer que cette neutralité n'est pas possible.

sis construction. Finally, Wm. Arnold STEVENS and Ernest DeWitt BURTON, *A Harmony of the Gospels for Historical Study. An Analytical Synopsis of the Four Gospels* (New York ⁵1905).

Jésus de passage parmi les Samaritains

Jn 4,4-42

Au sujet de Jn 4, l'unité de ce chapitre, sa structure et ses thèmes principaux, on trouve dans les commentaires une assez grande diversité d'opinions. La voie diachronique de la méthode historico-critique en effet aboutit à une pluralité de solutions possibles. Une étude de type structuraliste par contre, ne réussirait-elle pas à obtenir un jugement plus sûr concernant la cohérence et l'ordonnance du texte? C'est d'une telle lecture synchronique que les pages suivantes exposeront brièvement quelques résultats. Que l'on veuille bien m'excuser, çà et là, de quelque terme technique emprunté au structuralisme greimassien.

1. Texte et contexte.

Jn 4 contient deux changements de scène évidents. Au début, vv. 3-5, Jésus se déplace de la Judée en Samarie. A la fin, vv. 43-45, il quitte la Samarie pour la Galilée. Le récit 4,4-42 se joue entièrement en Samarie. A la rigueur, ce n'est qu'au v. 5 que «Jésus arrive à une ville de Samarie». Mais cette mention est précédée au v. 4 par une explication préliminaire du narrateur: «Il lui fallait *traverser* la Samarie». Cette remarque affecte immédiatement la suite, elle en «donne le ton» en la marquant d'abord comme un *passage*, une traversée. Il faut donc joindre le v. 4 au récit qui va suivre.

Le passage qui se joue en Samarie, est encadré de deux petites péricopes, dont l'une parle de la Judée, l'autre de la Galilée. Aux vv. 1-3 d'une part Jésus se trouve en face d'une collectivité: «les Pharisiens», dans une situation d'hostilité. Le départ de Jésus de la Judée s'explique le plus naturellement comme une fuite pour ses adversaires⁽¹⁾. Aux vv. 43-45 d'autre part Jésus se trouve de nouveau

(1) R. E. BROWN, *The Gospel according to John I* (New York 1966) 164-165, ne juge pas évident qu'il s'agit d'une fuite pour les Pharisiens judéens, puisqu'il y avait également des Pharisiens en Galilée.

en face d'une collectivité: «les Galiléens», cette fois dans une situation d'accueil bienveillant⁽²⁾. Ces deux «collectivités encadrantes», par devant et par derrière, permettent-elles de conclure à l'existence d'une troisième collectivité, celle qui est encadrée, «les Samaritains», comme antagoniste principal durant le «passage» de 4,4-42? Cela me semble probable. S'il en est ainsi, intituler le récit «Jésus et la Samaritaine», au singulier, (comme font plus ou moins Lagrange, van den Bussche, Brown et d'autres), serait à tout le moins incomplet. Et s'il s'agit vraiment d'une collectivité en 4,4-42, plutôt que de la seule Samaritaine, cette collectivité sera-t-elle de nature hostile, incroyante, ou plutôt bienveillante, croyante? Les Samaritains occupent une position intermédiaire, correspondant au caractère «passager» du récit: ils se trouvent en plein passage de l'ignorance (4,21-22) à la foi (4,42).

2. L'architecture du récit.

a. Il s'agit bien d'un récit selon les règles de l'art narratif: à une extrémité une situation initiale, et à l'autre une situation finale différente, reliée l'une à l'autre par un procès qui rend compte de la transformation qui se réalise. Regardons ces éléments de près. Les versets initiaux (4-6) localisent Jésus au puits de Jacob près de la ville de Sychar. Lui seul, il est le sujet de ces phrases, juif «sans relations avec les Samaritains» (v. 9). Aucun mot sur ses disciples. Aux vv. 40-42 en revanche Jésus se trouve entouré de toute une population samaritaine, venue à lui de la ville (vv. 30.39). C'est là, près du puits semble-t-il, que Jésus «reste deux jours» et que les Samaritains s'attachent à lui par leur confession de foi. Les disciples (v. 27), presque insensiblement, se sont mêlés à la foule.

Le procès qui relie ces deux pôles change la situation initiale en la situation finale. Il décrit le fait que et la façon dont Jésus réussit à entrer en communion avec les Samaritains, qui au fond lui étaient si étrangers. Jésus entre en scène en état de solitude; à la fin il a ras-

⁽²⁾ Bien que les vv. 43-45 soient «a notorious crux in the Fourth Gospel» (BROWN, *John I*, 186). La difficulté majeure disparaît pourtant, si on accepte l'identification johannique: «patrie» = la Judée; ainsi, après Origène, J. WILLEMSE, «La Patrie de Jésus selon saint Jean iv. 44», *NTS* 11 (1964-65) 349-364.

semblé autour de lui toute une ville. L'histoire racontée en 4,4-42 se réduit fondamentalement au procès de l'«acquisition» des Samaritains. Voilà le programme narratif englobant.

Afin de discerner l'articulation de ce programme, on se doit de trouver un indice narratif. Déjà un tel critère a servi pour délimiter 4,4-42 dans son contexte immédiat, le critère des déplacements. Ce même critère s'offre maintenant spontanément, puisque déjà dans l'introduction (qui d'ailleurs est plus qu'une simple introduction) une opposition locale se fait jour, l'opposition *ville* vs. *hors de la ville*⁽³⁾. Jésus arrive à la ville de Sychar (v. 5), mais sans y entrer il s'assoit près du puits hors de la ville (v. 6). Ce binôme topographique se répétera tout au long du récit. On assiste à un va-et-vient entre la ville et le puits (vv. 7. 8. 27. 28. 30) qui ne prend fin qu'à l'arrivée des Samaritains près de Jésus.

Le premier personnage qui arrive au puits, c'est la femme, venant de la ville (v. 7). Au terme du dialogue avec Jésus elle s'en va vers la ville (v. 28). Presqu'immédiatement après son retour ses compatriotes quittent la ville (v. 30), pour arriver après un certain temps près de Jésus (v. 40). Or, ces quatre mouvements entre la ville et le puits (*intérieur* vs. *extérieur*, mais: quel terme finalement s'identifie avec quel lieu?) mettent en évidence deux par deux deux subdivisions, dont chacune possède les trois traits essentiels d'un vrai récit: situation initiale, transformation, situation finale. Il s'agit de l'histoire de la femme et de celle des Samaritains.

La femme quitte la ville et vient au puits en état d'indigence, «pour tirer de l'eau» (v. 7). Par son dialogue avec elle Jésus lui fait découvrir ses besoins multiples en même temps que son véritable rassasiement (vv. 7-26). Enfin elle retourne à la ville, sans cruche (devenue inutile?!) pour dire qu'elle a trouvé le Messie (vv. 28-29). Les Samaritains à leur tour entrent en scène dans un état d'ignorance (v. 22), séparés des Juifs (v. 9), c.à d. de ceux qui adorent ce qu'ils connaissent. A l'appel de la femme ils se mettent en route vers Jésus et c'est autour de lui qu'ils finissent par reconnaître le Sauveur du monde (v. 42).

(3) Comparer Jn 18,28: «Alors ils mènent Jésus de chez Caïphe au prétoire [...]. Eux-mêmes n'entrèrent pas dans le prétoire». Cette opposition locale: *extérieur* vs. *intérieur* structure le récit du procès devant Pilate. Voir J. ESCANDE, «Jésus devant Pilate. Jean 18,28 - 19,24», *Cahiers Bibliques. Foi et Vie* 73 (1974) 66-82.

Le grand programme narratif 4,4-42 est donc composé de deux autres programmes de format plus réduit. Ce sont ces deux sous-programmes qui ensemble rendent compte de la transformation de l'état initial: Jésus assis seul près du puits, en l'état final: Jésus au milieu des Samaritains devenus croyants. L'état final du récit englobant coïncide avec l'état final du deuxième sous-programme, celui des Samaritains. Les derniers versets 40-42 font partie comme conclusion de deux récits à la fois, l'un sur le chemin de Jésus vers les Samaritains (4,4-42), l'autre sur le chemin des Samaritains vers le Sauveur du monde (4,28-42). Cette double appartenance explique la force singulièrement expressive de cette conclusion, une expressivité qui réside dans son contenu, certes, mais surtout dans la «qualité structurale» de cet accord final. En même temps cette coïncidence fait ressortir que la phase principale du grand récit 4,4-42 est à chercher dans l'histoire des Samaritains, et non dans celle de la femme. Ce qui confirme le pronostic exprimé plus haut à propos de la probabilité d'une «collectivité encadrée».

b. Pour voir plus clairement la relation entre les deux sous-programmes constatés et leur relation au programme narratif englobant, il convient d'entreprendre ici une analyse plus précise. Quelles sont, d'abord, les délimitations exactes des deux sous-programmes? L'histoire de la femme commence au v. 7: «Une femme de Samarie vient pour tirer de l'eau». Aucun doute possible. Mais cette histoire, où est-ce qu'elle prend fin: au v. 26, au v. 27 ou bien au v. 29? Les exégètes ne sont pas d'accord. Au point de vue narratif au contraire, le doute disparaît. L'histoire de la femme ne s'achève qu'au v. 29, lorsqu'elle proclame sa foi dans la ville. Les versets 28-29 sont indispensables au récit. On y trouve indiquée la conviction à laquelle est parvenue la femme grâce à sa rencontre avec Jésus, bref: l'état final de son histoire. L'auteur lui fait prononcer une évaluation de la transformation réalisée: élément fixe dans toute narration bien ordonnée, sans lequel nous n'aurions qu'un récit tronqué.

Le deuxième sous-programme par contre, celui des Samaritains, ne pose pas de problèmes quant à sa fin: impossible de méconnaître l'accord final du v. 42: «Nous savons que c'est vraiment lui le sauveur du monde». Mais où fixer le début de l'histoire: au v. 30, au v. 39? A en juger selon des critères narratifs on ne peut établir le commencement de l'histoire qu'au v. 28: «La femme [...] s'en alla à la ville et dit aux gens ...». Ici encore les versets 28-29 sont indispensables au récit. Bien que les Samaritains ne commencent à agir

qu'au v. 30: «Ils sortirent de la ville et s'acheminaient vers lui», en bonne logique narrative il faut quelqu'un ou quelque chose pour les mettre en route. Or, c'est la femme et sa «prédication» qui remplissent cette fonction.

Les délimitations respectives ainsi fixées révèlent que les deux sous-programmes se recouvrent partiellement. Là même où l'histoire de la femme s'achève (vv. 28-29), l'histoire des Samaritains prend son essor. Ces quelques lignes s'attachent aussi bien à ce qui précède qu'à ce qui suit. Regardant en arrière elles sont une finale, regardant en avant elles sont un début. Elles se distinguent par une ambivalence particulièrement suggestive. D'une part il y a plusieurs traits qui marquent le caractère final: le retour de la femme sur son lieu de départ, la ville; elle n'a plus besoin de sa cruche; ses paroles montrent qu'elle a trouvé ce qu'elle cherchait. D'autre part le caractère inchoatif s'exprime également en certains détails: la cruche a été laissée près du puits comme si elle attendait le retour de la femme (ce retour se produira effectivement en compagnie de ses compatriotes: v. 42 «Ils disaient à la femme...»); la femme continue à agir, elle interpelle les citoyens; son appel, *δεῦτε*, les met en mouvement et les invite à venir *avec* elle; enfin la forme interrogative de sa «prédication» souligne que son histoire s'ouvre à une séquence ultérieure.

La double appartenance des versets 28-29 aux deux sous-programmes, à l'un comme finale et à l'autre comme ouverture, permet une conclusion quant à leur relation mutuelle. L'histoire de la femme qui se termine en son action publique à l'égard des Samaritains, fonctionne (narrativement parlant) en premier lieu comme cause efficiente de l'histoire des Samaritains. Sa rencontre avec Jésus près du puits n'est pas racontée comme fin en soi. Au contraire. La femme qui se trouve «gagnée» par son interlocuteur Jésus devient pour lui le moyen de rassembler les villageois de Sychar. Sans «l'acquisition» de la femme, Jésus n'aurait pas eu la possibilité (la «compétence», dirait un structuraliste) d'atteindre les Samaritains. La parole de Jésus suscite la foi de la femme, et sa parole à elle suscitera à son tour la foi des Samaritains (v. 39). Le chemin de Jésus vers la multitude *pass*e (!) de fait par la foi de la personne humaine dans son individualité.

D'ailleurs, l'histoire de la femme ne se réduit pas à cette causalité instrumentale. On y découvre également une causalité exemplaire. La rencontre de Jésus avec la femme au puits joue le rôle d'une

situation-type pour chaque cheminement vers la foi. L'histoire des Samaritains en effet implique bien leur dialogue avec Jésus: «Nous l'avons nous-mêmes entendu» (v. 42; cf. v. 40), mais le texte n'en fait aucune mention explicite. Il semble permis de voir cette conversation typologiquement anticipée dans la rencontre de Jésus avec la femme. Par cette observation l'importance de cette première phase 4,7-29 dans la totalité du récit 4,4-42, bien qu'elle soit transitoire par rapport à l'histoire principale des Samaritains 4,28-42, se trouve suffisamment garantie.

Note sur le dialogue 4,7-26. A propos de sa structure je ne peux que souscrire aux observations de Michel Gourgues:

Ce dialogue comporte à son tour trois étapes très habilement agencées. De l'une à l'autre, on observe, en même temps qu'un changement et un déplacement apparemment peu cohérent des thèmes et des sujets d'intérêt, un approfondissement progressif du côté de la révélation et de la reconnaissance de Jésus. Dans la première partie du dialogue (4,7-15), c'est le thème de l'eau qui prédomine, avec tout le vocabulaire qui s'y rattache. Puis le thème disparaît et fait place à un bref échange sur la situation personnelle de la femme, où, en l'espace de trois versets (4,16-19), le terme «mari» (*anèr*) revient six fois. Ce thème disparaît à son tour et, dans la dernière partie (4,20-26), cède la place à celui du culte et de l'adoration⁽⁴⁾.

Dans ces trois parties se fait jour la triple «soif» de l'existence humaine: la soif physique de l'eau, la soif humaine de communion personnelle, la soif théologique de Dieu. Cette triple soif est partagée par Jésus (vv. 7. 27. 34). En sa soif en tant qu'homme il manifeste le désir même de son Père (v. 23: ζητεῖ). C'est cette notion du désir, jointe à celle, corrélatrice, de la vérité qui le comble (vv. 14. 18. 23-24), qui structure en profondeur tout le récit 4,4-42.

3. La fonction des disciples.

Les sujets du va-et-vient entre la ville et le puits ne sont pas seulement la femme et les Samaritains, mais aussi les disciples.

⁽⁴⁾ M. GOURGUES, *Pour que vous croyiez. Pistes d'exploration de l'évangile de Jean* (Paris 1982) 141.

Comment déterminer leur rôle dans l'ensemble du récit dont nous venons de voir les deux grandes étapes? Commençons par inventorier leurs mentions.

«Ses disciples» sont mentionnés pour la première fois après avoir laissé Jésus seul au puits, v. 8. La mention donne l'impression d'être un peu déplacée: il est vraisemblable en effet qu'ils soient arrivés au puits en compagnie de leur Maître et qu'ils l'aient quitté *avant* l'arrivée de la femme. Autrement, leur surprise à leur retour, v. 27 — voilà la deuxième mention —, s'explique difficilement. Puis, au v. 31, ils entrent en dialogue avec Jésus et sont là comme auditeurs de son discours, vv. 34-38.

Lorsqu'on projette ces mentions sur le fond du grand programme narratif 4,4-42, on constate que les disciples ne figurent qu'à l'intérieur des deux sous-programmes. Ils ne sont pas reliés aux articulations du récit englobant en tant que tel. L'examen de la fonction des disciples doit donc se concentrer sur leur fonction dans les deux sous-programmes respectifs.

Dans l'histoire de la femme (4,7-29) les disciples sont mentionnés une première fois, le récit à peine commencé: ils disparaissent de la scène (v. 8). Ils y réapparaissent juste avant la fin, lorsqu'ils rentrent (v. 27). Dès lors, les disciples sont présents dans cette histoire de la femme précisément par leur absence. C'est leur fonction ici de quitter le lieu, en se retirant dans la ville. Ils manifestent ainsi que la conversation dans laquelle Jésus suscite la foi de la femme est chose absolument personnelle. Personne ne pourrait y assister ou y intervenir. Les raisons et les intentions de ce dialogue ne concernent personne sauf Jésus et celle qui a été interpellée par lui (voir v. 27b!). Le caractère exclusif du dialogue de la foi est singulièrement mis en relief par ce qu'on pourrait appeler la fonction négative des disciples. Notons au passage que cette fonction va de pair (secondairement) avec une fonction positive: leur absence à l'égard de Jésus est en même temps présence dans la ville. Leur communion avec la vie dans la ville prépare l'entrée en scène des Samaritains (v. 28), avec qui les disciples resteront d'ailleurs implicitement associés (4,31-42).

Voyons maintenant la fonction des disciples dans le deuxième sous-programme, l'histoire des Samaritains. Les Samaritains s'étant mis en route (v. 30), les disciples adressent à Jésus une invitation à manger (v. 31). Lorsqu'ils se posent entre eux une question qui témoigne de leur manque de compréhension (v. 33), Jésus s'adresse à

eux dans un petit discours (vv. 34-38), qui se prolonge jusqu'à la rentrée en scène des Samaritains (v. 39). Dans la suite on n'entend plus parler des disciples. Dès lors, ce n'est que dans une sorte d'entr'acte qu'ils figurent. Leur conversation avec Jésus est un phénomène intercalé, et l'auteur prend soin de le souligner: «*Entre temps* — ἐν τῷ μεταξύ — les disciples le pressaient» (v. 31). Cette conversation n'entre pas dans la séquence narrative de l'histoire des Samaritains; elle s'en détache sensiblement et, par conséquent, elle entre forcément en relation avec le grand récit englobant 4,4-42 comme tel. Elle s'y rattache déjà quelque peu par le fait qu'ici, en ce tête-à-tête de Jésus avec ses disciples, il s'agit pour un moment de la même constellation de personnages qu'au début, aux versets d'introduction 4,4-6 (quoique les disciples n'y soient pas mentionnés explicitement). Mais c'est surtout le contenu de cette conversation qui se recommande maintenant à notre attention.

Dans le dialogue entre Jésus et ses disciples (4,31-38) on discerne deux parties, à première vue peu cohérentes. Une première où prédomine l'idée de manger, de nourriture, et qui s'achève sur l'interprétation «spirituelle» de ce besoin physique: «faire la volonté de celui qui m'a envoyé» (4,31-34). Une deuxième partie ensuite, où prédomine une idée toute différente, celle de moisson, de moissonneur, de semeur, de peiner, à laquelle s'ajoute l'interprétation «spirituelle» de la moisson, exprimée de façons variées (4,35-38).

Néanmoins, entre ces deux parties une unité profonde se fait jour. Il y a une analogie entre les deux, puisque l'une parle du Père, de Jésus et de son œuvre, et l'autre, de Jésus, de ses disciples et de leur œuvre. En chacune des deux il est question d'un envoi, le Père envoie Jésus (v. 34a), Jésus envoie ses disciples (v. 38a). Puis: Jésus accomplit une œuvre (v. 34b), les disciples vont moissonner (v. 38a), c.à.d. accomplir l'œuvre commencée par le semeur. Enfin: l'œuvre qu'accomplit Jésus, est l'œuvre du Père lui-même (αὐτοῦ τὸ ἔργον: v. 34b), et la moisson que les disciples font rentrer n'est pas le fruit de leur propre peine, mais de celle des autres, de l'autre (ὁ σπείρων: vv. 36-37). L'expression «avoir peiné» (κεκοπιάκ-: v. 38 deux fois) rappelle curieusement le début du récit où Jésus s'était assis près du puits fatigué de la route (κεκοπιακῶς: v. 6). La moisson des disciples paraît comme le fruit du labeur missionnaire de Jésus.

Or, cette analogie entre la relation des disciples avec Jésus et la relation de Jésus avec son Père, n'est autre chose que l'expression discursive de ce que le récit 4,4-42 représente de façon narrative. Si

nous voyons d'abord la relation entre Jésus, ses disciples et leur moisson (vv. 36-38), celle-ci se dessine en images vivantes dans les histoires successives de la femme et des Samaritains. Jésus fait de la femme son disciple en la conduisant à la foi (vv. 7-26). Puis, elle fait œuvre de missionnaire (Marsh par ex. va jusqu'à interpréter l'ordre de Jésus: «va, appelle ton mari» au v. 16 dans le sens d'un envoi apostolique) parmi les citoyens de Sychar (v. 29). Sa parole produit son effet: les Samaritains viennent à celui que la femme leur annonce (v. 30). Une fois parvenus à la pleine connaissance de Jésus dans la rencontre personnelle, ils disent à la femme que leur foi n'est pas le fruit de sa parole missionnaire, mais de la parole de Jésus lui-même (v. 42). Ce procès, on pourrait le transcrire en termes empruntés au discours de 4,37-38: Jésus a semé, la femme a été envoyée moissonner, mais le fruit de sa démarche auprès de ses concitoyens vient des peines de Jésus. La femme n'a été que l'instrument par lequel l'action de Jésus *passé*.

La relation de Jésus avec ses disciples et leur moisson apparaît dans le discours 4,31-38 comme la manifestation concrète, l'incarnation, de la relation du Père avec son envoyé, Jésus, et son œuvre. Comme Jésus est le sujet principal du récit en son entier, de façon analogue le Père en est le fond, la «source» (remarquer la distinction entre *πηγή* aux vv. 6. 14, et *φρέαρ* aux vv. 11. 12: «puits»). C'est le Père qui, «en recherche de vrais adorateurs» (v. 23), envoie Jésus à son labeur missionnaire. C'est lui qui lui fait traverser la Samarie d'après l'explication préliminaire au v. 4: «Il lui fallait traverser la Samarie», ce qui a un sens éminemment théologique, plus que simplement géographique⁽⁵⁾. Dans le dialogue de Jésus avec la femme, c'est le Père lui-même qui est à l'œuvre⁽⁶⁾. La reconnaissance du Messie que Jésus finit par moissonner de la bouche de la femme

(⁵) E. C. HOSKYNs - F. N. DAVEY, *The Fourth Gospel* (London 1947) 232: «Normally in the Fourth Gospel the verb *it is necessary* denotes a divine requirement (3,7.14.30; 4,20.24; 9,4; 10,16; 12,34; 20,9)». Ce sens théologique se recommande ici d'autant plus que la nécessité géographique n'était que relative: venant de Judée on pouvait suivre la vallée du Jourdain et entrer en Galilée à la hauteur de Scythopolis (Beisan), en évitant la Samarie. Toutefois, le chemin qui traversait la Samarie était le plus direct (JOSÈPHE, *Vita*, 269).

(⁶) Voir A. VANHOYE, «Notre foi, œuvre divine d'après le quatrième évangile», *NRT* 86 (1964) 337-354; et du même auteur: «L'œuvre du Christ, don du Père», *RSR* 48 (1960) 377-419.

(vv. 25-26), n'est autre chose que le premier murmure de l'eau vive, puisée par Jésus aux profondeurs du Père (vv. 11. 14). Cette eau, en passant par la femme, ne tardera pas à jaillir en vie éternelle pour ses compatriotes: «Venez voir un homme qui m'a dit tout ce que j'ai fait. Ne serait-ce pas le Christ?» (v. 29). Voilà l'accomplissement de l'œuvre du Père, réalisé par Jésus: l'adoration du Père dans l'esprit que donne Jésus et dans la vérité qu'est Jésus, une adoration qui s'épanouit dans l'existence de témoin (μαρτυρούσα: v. 39) d'un homme croyant.

4. Conclusion.

La lecture synchronique aboutit à une vue d'ensemble dans laquelle les éléments principaux du texte: discours et narration en ses étapes respectives, s'intègrent sans peine. Des thèmes théologiques et christologiques, ecclésiologiques, anthropologiques et mystiques y vont de pair. Le monde johannique s'y reflète fidèlement. C'est peut-être surtout une théologie de la mission qui s'en dégage. A propos de ce thème missionnaire, R. Bultmann déjà avait remarqué que les versets 39-42 seraient une application de la pensée exprimée aux versets précédents (35-38): dans le labeur des envoyés c'est Jésus lui-même qui est à l'œuvre⁽⁷⁾. Malheureusement la méthode de décomposition littéraire pratiquée par Bultmann l'a empêché d'étendre cette interprétation exacte de la finale à tout le récit 4,4-42 en son ensemble.

Abdij Sint Benedictusberg, Vaals
6295 NA Lemiers
Pays-Bas

Adrien LENGLET, O.S.B.

(7) R. BULTMANN, *Das Evangelium des Johannes* (Göttingen 181964) 148: «Der aus V. 35-38 gewonnene Gedanke, dass im Wirken der Boten Jesus selber wirkt, findet sofort seine Anwendung, indem nun [c.à.d. aux vv. 39-42] das Thema der christlichen Verkündigung vom Gesichtspunkt der Hörer aus behandelt wird: der vermittelnde Bote ist von entscheidender Bedeutung, denn er führt ja die Anderen zu Jesus; aber eben damit erledigt er sich selbst, und der Hörer-‘zweiter Hand’ wird zum Hörer-‘erster Hand’».

SUMMARY

A synchronical reading of John 4,4-42 shows that the narrative program, Jesus' gathering of the Samaritans around himself, is realised by means of two overlapping sub-programs, namely that of the woman (4,7-29), and that of the Samaritans themselves (4,28-42). The story of the woman is the phase by which the revelation of Jesus is able to *pass* (cf. 4,4) to the Samaritans. The primary function of the disciples is (1) to mark by their absence (4,7.27) the absolutely personal character of the dialogue between Jesus and the woman, and (2) to enter into dialogue with Jesus (4,31-38). Jesus' discourse (esp. vv. 32. 34. 37-38) echoes and comments on the structure of the narrative.

Symmetry and Theology in the Old Testament Citations of Heb 1,5-14

I. The Seven Old Testament Citations in Heb 1,5-14

In my previous article ("Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1-14", *Bib* 66 [1985] 168-189), I attempted to show that there is a numerical symmetry between the seven Christological designations in Heb 1,2b-4 and the seven Old Testament citations in 1,5-14. Moreover, we saw that the seven designations in 1,2b-4 form a definite ring pattern, moving from exaltation back through creation to preexistence and forward again through creation to exaltation. In the present article I pose the further question: Is the symmetry between 1,2b-4 and 1,5-14 merely numerical, or do the seven Old Testament citations correspond to 1,2b-4 not only in number but also in general movement of thought? Is the parallel not only numerical but also theological? To answer this question, I shall investigate in this article the theological import and thrust of each of the seven citations.

One point, however, should be made clear before we start. In Heb 1,2b-4 the author was free to write what he wanted, down to the individual words, and to arrange what he wrote in whatever order and pattern pleased him. Obviously, in the case of a catena of OT quotations, he does not enjoy the same absolute freedom. He is not free to undertake a massive rewriting of the OT texts; this would undermine the very purpose of quoting the OT as an authority. Rather, the author can insinuate his theological program by means of the order he gives the catena and by the interpretative remarks he makes in an introduction or a conclusion. Granted the "given" nature of the OT citations, we may not always be sure exactly how much of the quotation is being pressed into service for the author's theological message. What we must ask, therefore, is whether the general movement of thought in the seven quotations corresponds to the general movement of thought in the seven designations. To be more precise: in light of the natural constraints on

our author as he quotes OT texts, I am not claiming a one-for-one correspondence between each designation and the numerically equivalent citation, but rather a general correspondence in the over-all movement of thought. With this in mind, let us look at the individual quotations⁽¹⁾.

(1) and (2). I have already examined the first two citations in reference to v. 4 in my previous article. We have seen that they are directly connected with v. 4 by *gar*, indicating that the OT texts somehow support or ground what is said in v. 4. But v. 4, as we now know, refers to the superior status Christ enjoys vis-à-vis the angels as a result of his exaltation at the right hand (v. 3d). Consequently the flow of thought seems to indicate that God is speaking to the Son at or immediately after the exaltation⁽²⁾. The "today" when God "has begotten the Son" is the day of enthronement at the right hand. Efforts, therefore, to connect Hebrew's use of Ps 2,7 with such events as Christ's eternal generation, the annunciation, the nativity, the baptism by John, or the transfiguration, miss the particular cast of our author's thought⁽³⁾. He is closer to the homily of Paul addressed to Hellenistic Jews in a diaspora synagogue in Acts 13,33⁽⁴⁾, where Ps 2,7 is applied to the resurrection. The idea that Jesus is constituted Son at the resurrection/exaltation is also clear in

(1) For a general orientation on the use of the OT in Hebrews, see S. KISTEMAKER, *The Psalm Citations in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (Amsterdam 1961); and R. REID, *The Use of the Old Testament in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (typewritten thesis; NY: Union Theological Seminary, 1964). For general considerations of form, function, sources, and theology of Heb 1,5-14, see O. HOFIUS, *Der Christushymnus Philipper 2,6-11* (Tübingen 1976) 86, 88-89; D. HAY, *Glory at the Right Hand* (Nashville 1973) 39, 144-145; E. GRÄSSER, "Der Hebräerbrief 1938-1963", *TR* 30 (1964) 138-236, especially 208-209; C. SPICQ, *L'épître aux Hébreux* (2 vols.; Paris 1952 and 1953) 2,15; H. MONTEFIORE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (London 1964) 43-44; G. HUGHES, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics* (Cambridge 1979) 7-8; J. THOMPSON, "The Structure and Purpose of the Catena in Hebrews 1,5-13", *The Beginnings of Christian Philosophy* (Washington, D.C. 1982) 128-140; L. DEY, *The Intermediary World and Patterns of Perfection in Philo and Hebrews* (Missoula 1975) 146-147; O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Göttingen 1966) 109, 125.

(2) So THOMPSON, "Structure", 131.

(3) So correctly A. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ* (Paris 1969) 140-142.

(4) One cannot help remarking on the similarity of *Sitz im Leben* between Paul's homily and the homily that is the Epistle to the Hebrews.

the pre-Pauline creedal formula of Rom 1,3-4⁽⁵⁾. That Ps 2,7 is to be understood in terms of exaltation is confirmed by our author when he brings together Ps 2,7 and Ps 109,4 in Heb 5,5-6 as two proclamations of God to Christ, apparently spoken at the same time⁽⁶⁾. From the whole theology of the Epistle it is clear that Christ becomes priest by his death and entrance into the heavenly sanctuary: "If he were on earth, he would not be a priest" (8,4). Hence, in the mind of our author, Ps 109,4 is spoken by God to Christ at or around the time of his death-exaltation. Since the author ties Ps 2,7 so closely to Ps 109,4 in 5,5-6, he seems to envision the same setting for the proclamation of sonship. And, if Ps 2,7 refers to the exaltation in Heb 5,5, there is no reason to think it refers to something else in 1,5⁽⁷⁾. Once we have established this time-frame for Ps 2,7 in Heb 1,5, the same would hold true for the citation of 2 Sam 7,14 in the second half of the same verse. The second quotation simply repeats the content of the first in different phrases. Indeed, it is difficult to see what 2 Sam 7,14 really contributes to the argument except a deft inclusion (*huios... huion*);

⁽⁵⁾ Similar in thought is the climax of Peter's Pentecost speech in Acts 2,36, but here Lord and Christ are used as titles of exaltation, not Son.

⁽⁶⁾ MICHEL (*Brief*, 219) rightly observes on 5,5-6: "By two statements in the Psalm, God himself has conferred on him [Christ] the dignity of Son and Priest" (translation mine). Yet Michel hesitates over whether the oracles refer to Christ as exalted or as preexistent; on p. 110 he seems to decide in favor of a primordial event. BRUCE is better on this point (*Hebrews*, 94): "... 'this day' in our author's mind is the day of Christ's enthronement... And, says our author, the same God who acclaimed Jesus as His Son also acclaimed Him as perpetual high priest"; see also his remarks on p. 13. PETERSON (*Hebrews and Perfection*, 85) is also strong on enthronement. B. WESTCOTT (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [London 1889] 21) speaks in terms of resurrection and ascension; so too, P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 54. Contrary to most, J. MOFFATT (*The Epistle to the Hebrews* [New York 1924] 9-10) claims that no specific time or event is envisaged in the "today I have begotten you."

⁽⁷⁾ So PETERSON, *Hebrews and Perfection*, 118-119; *contra* MONTEFIORE (*Hebrews*, 44), who applies the text to the eternal generation of the Son; so too, J. BONSRIVEN, *Saint Paul. Épître aux Hébreux* (Paris 1943) 190. It is interesting to see how Montefiore appeals to what must be the "logical" progression of thought: "he [the author] starts at the beginning". One sees the importance of grasping that the "logic" of our author can take the shape of a ring.

everything important has already been said by Ps 2,7⁽⁸⁾. One wonders whether this “back-up” citation is included merely to bring the number of quotations in the catena up to the desired seven.

(3) The third citation brings with it a number of problems involving both the introductory formula and the text itself. What seems clear from the start is that the OT text is a command from God that all the angels of God adore *him*, presumably the Son. But when is the command issued? The introductory formula is opaque: “But when again he brings the first-born into the [inhabited] world, he says (*hotan de palin eisagagē ton prōtotokon eis tēn oikoumenēn, legei*)”. Commentators’ suggestions with regard to the time of speaking and “bringing in” range from preexistence through Christ’s nativity to his exaltation or parousia⁽⁹⁾. One fairly firm starting point comes from our author’s use of *oikoumenē*. In Hebrews, *oikoumenē* does not mean this empirical, visible, inhabited world of ours, as general and NT Greek usage would lead us to expect. Rather, the “humane”, “civilized” sense inherent in *oikoumenē* and its use in the LXX lead our middle-platonic author to apply it to the true world, where the holy assembly lives (12,22-24; cf. 13,14). This is the “upper”, heavenly world, the *oikoumenē* which, from the perspective of those on this earth, is still to come (*tēn oikoumenēn tēn mellousan* of 2,5, where there is again a negation of the angels’ supposed superior status: *ou gar aggelois*)⁽¹⁰⁾. By contrast, when our author speaks of the preexistent Son coming into this empirical world of ours, he uses *kosmos* (10,5). Indeed, *kosmos* at times can take on the pejorative meaning of sinful humanity (11,7.38). Our author does not use *oikoumenē* in such a sense.

⁽⁸⁾ It is interesting to observe how the commentaries generally spend a great amount of time reviewing the original meaning of the text and of various OT parallels. Having explained how Ps 2,7 functions in Hebrews 1, they find very little to say about the function of 2 Sam 7,14.

⁽⁹⁾ For the various opinions, see VANHOYE, *Situation*, 152. What follows is indebted to his treatment on pp. 152-156.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Commentators often quarrel over whether the theology of Hebrews is dominated by a gnosticizing *Weltanschauung* which thinks spatially of the world above and below or by a Jewish-apocalyptic mentality which thinks in terms of present versus future. The opposition is a false one. The author has synthesized gnosticizing and eschatological currents of thought. What is now present in the world above remains the future goal of believers still living in this world. It is a commonplace of Jewish apocalyptic that the goods of the end-time are already present and reserved for the faithful in heaven.

If *oikoumenē* in 1,6 does mean the heavenly world, what event could be described in terms of “when again he [God] brings the first-born [Christ] into the heavenly world”? It can hardly be the nativity of Christ on earth, given the meaning of *oikoumenē* in Hebrews. Besides, in Luke 2,13-14, the angels do not adore Christ but praise the Father—to say nothing of the dubious procedure of using the special infancy-narrative material of Luke to exegete Hebrews⁽¹¹⁾! A reference to the parousia is also unlikely. The normal scenario for the parousia demands that Christ come from heaven back to earth, not that he be led into heaven. Moreover, the adoration of Christ by the angels is not a usual motif in descriptions of the parousia⁽¹²⁾. Could the reference be to an event in the Son’s preexistent state, as in the *prōtotokos pasēs ktiseōs* in Col 1,15? Since the author has already spoken of the Son’s mediation of creation and of his eternal existence with God, it is difficult to understand how or why God would “bring him into” the heavenly world, when the Son would have existed prior to the heavenly world and would have helped create it. By a process of elimination, then, the most likely reference is to the exaltation. This is not surprising, since the theme of Christ’s *entrance* into the heavenly sanctuary and his enthronement there are at the heart of the Epistle’s theology⁽¹³⁾.

(11) This is precisely the mistake of A. CERNUDA (“La introducción del Primogénito, según Hebr 1,6”, *EstBib* 39[1981]107-153), who goes so far as to see in 1,6a a veiled reference to the virginal conception! It might be observed, with regard to this question, that, for Hebrews, the time of Jesus’ earthly life is the time when he is lower than the angels, not the time when he is adored by them (2,9).

(12) Cf. F. SCHIERSE, *Verheissung und Heilsvollendung* (Munich 1955) 95. I would therefore disagree with MICHEL (*Brief*, 113), who seems to prefer a reference to the parousia, although he also mentions the birth of Christ. J. HÉRING (*L’épître aux Hébreux* [Neuchâtel 1954] 25) also opts for the parousia.

(13) In support of this it should be noted that almost all the occurrences of *eiserchomai* in the Epistle refer to entrance into the heavenly sanctuary or rest, or into their earthly types (earthly tent, promised land). The sole exception is 10,5, which refers to the incarnation. In favor of enthronement, but with a convoluted explanation of the thought, is P. ANDRIESEN, “La teneur judéo-chrétienne de He I,6 et II, 14B-III,2”, *NT* 18(1976)293-313. Also in favor of enthronement are J. H. DAVIES, *A Letter to Hebrews* (Cambridge 1967) 22; F. F. BRUCE, *The Epistle to the Hebrews* (Grand Rapids 1964) 17; PETERSON, *Hebrews and Perfection*, 214 n. 19.

Prōtotokos therefore has nothing to do with the usage in Luke 2,7 or Col 1,15⁽¹⁴⁾. Although this occurrence in Heb 1,6 is unique in the NT since *prōtotokos* is used here absolutely, a genuine parallel in thought can be found in Col 1,18, *prōtotokos ek tōn nekrōn*⁽¹⁵⁾. The one obstacle to this interpretation is the presence of *palin*, "again", in the introductory formula. What does it mean to say that God "again" brings the Son into the heavenly world? The phrase could refer to the *descensus-ascensus* schema: the preexistent Son left the heavenly world (*oikoumenē*) for awhile, entered this visible world (*kosmos*, 10,5), became for a short while lower than the angels (2,9), then through death and exaltation re-entered the heavenly world. More probable, in my opinion, is the position that *palin* properly goes with *de* and functions as a connective word linking together the various citations of the catena—as do *palin* in v. 5, *men... de* in vv. 7-8, *kai* in v. 10, and *de* in v. 13. Granted, the presence of *palin* in the *hotan* clause strikes one as unusual, if *palin* is meant to tie the whole clause—and the whole citation—to what precedes. But two considerations help explain the position of *palin*. (1) If *palin* is taken with *de*, then the whole connecting phrase is *de palin*. But *de*, being a postpositive, necessarily goes after the first word of the sentence, in this case *hotan*. *Palin* simply follows along after *de*, which must stand within the *hotan* clause. (2) The construction is not totally without parallel; a somewhat similar case occurs in Wis 14,1. The author of Wisdom has been discussing idolatry and the senselessness of making and worshiping an idol (13,10-19). As he begins a new example of idolatry, he says in 14,1, *ploun tis palin stellomenos*. The sense is not: "One preparing again to sail...", but rather "Again [to use another example], one preparing to sail..."⁽¹⁶⁾. Although *palin* occurs within the participial clause, it really functions "in front of" the clause, acting as a connective which enumerates.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Contra MONTEFIORE, *Hebrews*, 46.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See also *ho prōtotokos tōn nekrōn* in Rev 1,5; the *prōtotokon en poliois adelphois* of Rom 8,29 also occurs in a general context of resurrection and glorification. There is, of course, a slight difference in meaning in Hebrews, since Christ's exaltation rather than his resurrection is the main theological category.

⁽¹⁶⁾ So, with variations, RSV, NAB, NEB, and JB. BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 15 n. 71, rightly rejects the objections of WESTCOTT (*Hebrews*, 21-22), who takes *palin* closely with *eisagagē* and sees a reference to the parousia.

The same is true of the *palin* in Heb 1,6a⁽¹⁷⁾. The use of the aorist subjunctive with *hotan*, which often carries the sense of future action or habitual action, need not rule out a reference to the exaltation. The exaltation is a future event when viewed from the time of the original utterance of the prophecy; Scripture attests that God predicted this event⁽¹⁸⁾. All things considered, therefore, 1,6a is best taken as referring to the exaltation/enthronement of the Son, before whom the angels bow down in worship. The *prōtotokos* theme is apparently continuing the Davidic-enthronement motif of the first two citations. If so, the use of *prōtotokos* in 1,6a may allude to LXX Ps 88,28: "And I will make him the first-born (*prōtokon*), the highest among the kings of the earth,"—perhaps picking up the allusion to Ps 2,8 standing behind *hon ethēken klēronomon pantōn* in 1,2b⁽¹⁹⁾.

The sense of 1,6 is thus fairly clear⁽²⁰⁾. When God brings the crucified and exalted Son into the heavenly throneroom and seats

(17) While basically agreeing with this line of argument, VANHOYE (*Situation*, 154) prefers to see in *palin* in 1,6a an added sense of opposition ("on the other hand", "on the contrary"), while *palin* in v. 5 simply expressed coordination. SPICQ (*L'épître*, 2,17) also considers this possibility. BRUCE (*Hebrews*, 15 n. 72) rejects a "strongly adversative" sense in 1,6a; see also THOMPSON, "Structure", 132 n. 18. Strangely, MOFFATT (*Hebrews*, 10) takes *palin* as a connective but then applies the citation to the incarnation or the parousia; similarly, E. GRÄSSER, "Hebräer 1,1-4. Ein exegetischer Versuch", *Text und Situation* (Gütersloh 1973) 216, who opts for the parousia, following KÄSEMANN, *Gottesvolk*, 59-60, 68.

(18) So VANHOYE, *Situation*, 152-153; P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 58.

(19) So VANHOYE, *Situation*, 158. See also BRUCE (*Hebrews*, 15), who unnecessarily brings preexistence into consideration here. I would not agree with Käsemann and Grässer, who see in *prōtotokos* a reference to the Gnostic Anthropos-myth; see, e.g., GRÄSSER, *Der Glaube im Hebräerbrief* (Marburg 1965) 209; also G. THEISSEN, *Untersuchungen zum Hebräerbrief* (Gütersloh 1969) 62, 122.

(20) The question of the exact source of the conflated quotation (LXX Deut 32,43 and LXX Ps 96,7) in Heb 1,6b does not touch upon our problematic. For the light that the Deuteronomy fragment from Cave 4 at Qumran throws on the problem, see P. SKEHAN, "A Fragment of the 'Song of Moses' (Deut. 32) from Qumran", *BASOR* 136(1954)12-15; IDEM, *Studies in Israelite Poetry and Wisdom* (Washington 1971) 67-77, especially 77; P. KATZ, "The Quotations from Deuteronomy in Hebrews", *ZNW* 49(1958) 213-223; P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 59; VANHOYE, *Situation*, 161-163; REID, *The Use*, 57-58.

him at his right hand, he bids all his angels adore him⁽²¹⁾. The "all" (*pantes*) is no doubt important to our author; the Son is *kreit-tōn aggelōn*, without exception. Their *proskynēsis* ritually confirms that fact.

(4) The introduction to the fourth citation (LXX Ps 103,4) offers only one problem. The preposition *pros* is used here with a verb of saying to mean, not "to", but rather "with regard to", "concerning". Not only is this usage philologically possible; it also seems demanded by the citation, which speaks of the angels in the third person. The usage is startling only for those who take the *pros* in v. 8a to mean "to", as it surely does mean in v. 13⁽²²⁾. In the citation itself, our author construes the meaning of the text differently from the most probable sense of the MT⁽²³⁾. The MT conveys the idea that God makes the winds his messengers and flaming fire his servants. The verse is part of a nature-hymn praising God the Creator in lyric terms: the natural elements obey God's commands. The LXX opens up the possibility of a different interpretation by placing definite articles before *aggelous* and *leitourgous*, which can now be read as the direct objects instead of the predicate accusatives⁽²⁴⁾. The author of Hebrews adopts such a reading: "He who makes his angels winds [or possibly, spirits] and his servants [i.e., the angels] a flame of fire". The imagery of the verse could refer to the rarefied "stuff" of which angels were thought to be composed, or to the rapidity of the angels' flight as they carry out commissions, or to the ancient idea that angels presided over or even were embodied in natural phenomena such as wind and fire. In the context of such

(21) Needless to say, this key Christological point is what forces the author to write the OT citation with *aggeloi theou* as the subject, while the LXX of Deut 32,43 reads *huiou theou*. Since the whole point of the catena is the superiority of the one Son to all the angels, it simply will not do to cite a text in which the angels are called "all the sons of God". KISTEMAKER (*Psalm Citations*, 74) allows for the possibility that our author knew a variant reading of the Greek OT.

(22) See MICHEL, *Brief*, 117. Some connect this dispute with the debate over the meaning of *ho theos* in v. 8b; see below.

(23) This is disputed by WESTCOTT, (*Hebrews*, 24), who holds that the LXX correctly interprets the MT; so also *Str-B* 3.678-679, who point out that certain rabbinic passages reflect the interpretation of the LXX and Hebrews.

(24) Cf. KISTEMAKER, *Psalm Citations*, 77; VANHOYE, *Situation*, 170; BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 17.

speculation, Jewish thought sometimes stressed the ongoing nature of God's creative activity upon the angels. That there was speculation about the creation and composition of the angels before, during, and after the time of our author is clear from Jewish sources. In the Thanksgiving Psalms of Qumran, in the slightly mutilated text of 1QH 1,9-11, God the Creator is said to create every spirit (or wind, *rwḥ*), as well as the heavens and the hosts, and the spirits (*rwḥwt*) of might, "before they become angels [of holiness] and spirits [*rwḥwt*] of eternity". In 4 Ezra, in the context of a prayer to God the Creator, it is said in the Syriac version that at God's command the angels "are changed to wind and fire" (RSV, 2 Esdras 8,22). Later rabbinic material includes *b. Hag.* 14a ("Every day ministering angels are created from the fiery stream [of God's throne] and utter song and cease to be") and *Yal. Šim'oni* 2.11.3 ("God changes us [the angels] hour by hour... sometimes he makes us fire, and sometimes wind")⁽²⁵⁾.

Similarly, in Heb 1,7 the subordination of the angels is reaffirmed and specified: the Creator can cause his angels to change, and indeed change often. The angels are creatures, subject to fluctuation, while the Creator (by implication) is above such change. The theme of the sixth citation is already being subtly introduced. There is, of course, another alteration in the meaning of the Psalm verse. The OT text, in its original sense, obviously referred to Yahweh. But in the catena of Heb 1,5-14, it is the Son who is mentioned in every OT text, either in the second or in the third person. Indeed, in the sixth quotation (1,10-12), while God (the Father) is the speaker, he is never referred to in the text; only the Son is mentioned. Unless we are to think that the fourth citation forms a strange exception, *ho poiōn* has to be taken as referring to the Son, not God (the Father). Thus, as in the third quotation, our author boldly and without further ado or justification applies an OT text which speaks of Yahweh to the Son. Like God (the Father), the Son is superior to the angels, who are subject to change; that much is clear. But the vocabulary of the citation may suggest a further point as well. Granted what the author has already said in chap. 1, *ho poiōn*, as applied to the Son, may carry the weighty meaning of "create": "he who creates his angels as winds, and his servants as a flame of fire". This is not

⁽²⁵⁾ For these texts, see BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 18 n. 81; WESTCOTT, *Hebrews*, 25; MOFFATT, *Hebrews*, 12.

impossible, since the Son's mediation of creation in v. 2c was proclaimed with the help of the verb *poieō*; the *aiōnas* which he helped create would certainly include the angels. Taken in this full sense, the fourth quotation moves beyond the first three not only by affirming the superiority of the enthroned Son over the worshipping angels, but also by grounding this superiority in the unchanging Son's act of creating changeable angels⁽²⁶⁾. Indeed, the present participle *poiōn* could be understood to refer to a continuing act of creation, something Jewish speculation would support. Thus, the thought of the catena shifts subtly from exaltation to creation.

(5) The *pros* in the introduction to the fifth quotation can be taken in the sense of "of," "concerning" (so NAB, NEB, RSV, TEV, Goodspeed, and Phillips) or "to" (so KJV and JB). Actually, this choice does not necessarily determine the sense of the quotation⁽²⁷⁾. Most of the English versions which translate *pros* as "of" or "concerning" proceed to take the quotation as direct address, with the first *ho theos* understood as a substitute for the vocative. The choice of "of" or "concerning" seems dictated rather by a desire to keep the same meaning for *pros* in v. 7 and v. 8.

Both the MT and the LXX forms of Ps 45,6-7 (vv. 7-8 in the MT; LXX Ps 44,7-8) bristle with problems of text and interpretation. Fortunately, many of the problems do not concern our line of investigation. The most important question for us is how one should read the first line of the citation in Heb 1,8. If we accept the text of *UBSGNT*, the best translation is: "Your throne, O God, [is/stands] forever and ever"⁽²⁸⁾. The Son is thus addressed directly

(26) Cf. KISTEMAKER, *Psalm Citations*, 79: "[Heb 1,7] indicates first, that the Son was present and active at the time of creation. Thus, while the Son is designated as Lord of creation, it follows that the angels are but mere creatures. Second, it stresses the unchangeableness of the Lord". According to Westcott, the Greek Fathers laid great stress on *poiōn* as distinguishing the created angels from the uncreated Son (*Hebrews*, 25). For a somewhat different interpretation, see P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 62.

(27) A point missed by G. BUCHANAN, *To the Hebrews* (Garden City, NY 1972) 20.

(28) The text of Heb 1,8 in the third edition of *UBSGNT* is the same as that of the first edition. The one variant noted is at the end of v. 8: *autou* (papyrus 46, Sinaiticus, Vaticanus) for *sou* (Vast majority of witnesses); *sou* is preferred but is given only a C rating (considerable degree of doubt). Indeed, the 20th edition of NESTLE-ALAND, *Novum Testamentum Graece et*

as God, the nominative with article substituting for the vocative⁽²⁹⁾. Such a use of *theos* for the Son is not very startling after the statements about creation, eternal preexistence, and conservation of creation in 1,2b-3b. The usage is not far removed from John 1,1.18; 20,28—though John is not citing an OT text. Some commentators, however, would prefer to avoid this attribution of *theos* to the Son by translating: “Your throne is God forever and ever”, or “God is your throne forever and ever”. Whatever be the meaning of the MT and the LXX, such a translation does not make terribly good sense in the context of the theology of Hebrews. The Son is always portrayed by our author as sitting at the right hand of God (e.g., 1,3d). Indeed, in 8,1 our author expands on the image by specifying that the Son “sat at the right hand of the throne of the majesty in the heavens [*ekathisen en dexiā tou thronou tēs megalōsynēs en tois ouranois*], an obvious expansion on the phrase in 1,3. God (the Father) has a throne in heaven, at the right of which the Son sits. Granted this key image, it is difficult to understand what it would mean to our author to say that God (the Father) is the eternal throne on which the Son sits. Taking *ho theos* as equivalent to the vocative is by far the simplest interpretation. Once we understand

Latine (Stuttgart 1961) preferred *autou*. The wording of the 26th edition of NESTLE-ALAND, *Greek-English New Testament* (Stuttgart 1981) is identical to the third edition of the UBSGNT, as is also the wording of the ninth edition of A. MERK, *Novum Testamentum Graece et Latine* (Rome 1964). For the debate on *sou* versus *autou* and resulting translations, see B. METZGER, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* (New York 1971) 662-663. In favor of reading *autou* and taking *ho theos* as the subject of the sentence is KISTEMAKER, *Psalm Citations*, 25, including n. 1; see also WESTCOTT, *Hebrews*, 25-26. In favor of taking *ho theos* as vocative are F. BÜCHSEL, *Die Christologie der Hebräerbriefs* (Gütersloh 1922) 22; MICHEL, *Brief*, 118; MONTEFIORE, *Hebrews*, 47; P. TEODORICO, *L'epistola agli Ebrei* (Turin 1952) 51; BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 19; P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 64; and possibly MOPFATT, *Hebrews*, 13 n. 1, who points out this creates a perfect parallel with *kyrie* at the beginning of the sixth citation in 1,10. VANHOYE (*Situation*, 176-177) gives a detailed vindication of the vocative understanding and answers Westcott's objections. He points out the vocative sense of *ho theos* in the citation of LXX Ps 39,9, in Heb 10,7.

(²⁹) The vocative *thee* occurs only in Matt 27,46 in the NT and is rare in the LXX. Contrast Mark's *Ho theos mou ho theos mou* in 15,34 with Matthew's *thee mou thee mou* in 27,46. Elsewhere in the NT *ho theos* is used for the vocative; cf. BDF #147, (3); and VANHOYE, *Situation*, 176.

ho theos as an address to the Son, the reference to the eternal throne must be taken in its widest sense: it symbolizes not just the exaltation after Christ's death, but rather the eternal rule which the preexistent divine Son has exercised from all eternity. The citation then goes on to praise the Son's eternal rule (*basileia*) as one guided by uprightness (v. 8c). This upright rule is the result of the divine king's love of justice and hatred of evil. Vanhoye wishes to see in the aorists *ēgapēsas* and *emisēsas* (v. 9a) a reference to Christ's life and struggle on earth⁽³⁰⁾. This is possible, but the aorists could be taken simply as literal translations of the Hebrew stative perfect followed by the *wayyiqṭōl* form, both with a present meaning⁽³¹⁾. Here we run up against the problem of how far we can press the wording of these OT citations for precise Christological references⁽³²⁾. Are we to see a specific reference to the anointing of *Christ* (hence *echrisen*) as king and priest at his exaltation? Or is the reference general: the anointing belongs in timeless eternity, as does the throne and the kingdom? In this case, it is simply a symbol of supreme happiness. One reason it is difficult to evaluate the precise sense of *echrisen* is that the author of Hebrews never uses the word again. He does not speak of the exaltation/enthronement in terms of anointing; it is one element in the allegory of becoming a priest that he omits. Perhaps the absence of any *chriō*-terminology in the author's own statements indicates that the *echrisen* in this citation holds no precise reference for him⁽³³⁾.

⁽³⁰⁾ VANHOYE, *Situation*, 186-188; similarly, MICHEL, *Brief*, 119.

⁽³¹⁾ P. JOÜON (*Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* [Rome 1923; reprinted 1965] #118 p, p. 325) uses this verse to exemplify a stative *qatal* with a present sense followed by a *wayyiqṭōl* with a present sense. So the RSV's translation of Ps 45,7: "You love righteousness and hate wickedness"; similarly, with variations in the wording, Goodspeed, JB, and NAB.

⁽³²⁾ P. Hughes wisely remarks: "There is no necessity to seek particular significance in every part of a somewhat extended quotation for our immediate context" (*Hebrews*, 66).

⁽³³⁾ In favor of taking the anointing to refer to the ascension or exaltation is SPICQ (*L'épître*, 2.19); WESTCOTT, *Hebrews*, 27; P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 65. VANHOYE (*Situation*, 192) relates the anointing to the theme of the perfection of Christ. But where is that connection made by our author? The tendency of Vanhoye to press every word of the OT citation for precise Christian meaning can be seen in his suggestion—made, however, with much hesitation—that the rod or scepter in Heb 1,8 refers to the cross (pp. 194-195).

On the other hand, a precise reference may be found in the *metochous* of v. 9c. Granted the context, which emphasizes the superiority of the Son over the angels, the *metochous* is best taken as the angels. True, all the other uses of *metochos* in Hebrews refer to Christians (3,1.14;6,4;12,8); but this is a perfect example of immediate context determining sense. In chap. 1, the main point is the relation of the Son to the angels, not to Christians⁽³⁴⁾. What is affirmed throughout is the Son's absolute superiority over the angels. Hence, *metochous*, if it has any precise meaning, refers to the angels gathered around their king, and *para* probably carries an exclusive rather than a truly comparative sense: the Son is anointed, the angels are not⁽³⁵⁾. In sum, while the author may or may not see some references to Christ's earthly life and exaltation in the fifth citation, the most astounding and salient aspect of his use of this psalm is the application of the name *theos* to the Son. The Son is God, and therefore his throne stands forever and ever and his rule is necessarily righteous. The emphasis seems to be on the Son's divinity and preexistence, as expressed in our author's mind in v. 8b; this provides the supreme argument for the superiority of the Son over the

BONSIRVEN (*Épître*, 196) prefers to see the anointing as an expression of the eternal divine generation.—As for the *ho theos ho theos sou* of Heb 1,9, the sense could be either "God, your God has anointed you" (subject and noun in apposition) or "Your God has anointed you, O God" (subject of sentence and vocative; so VANHOYE, *Situation*, 189). Though the latter may sound strange, a similar dialectical use of *theos* in one sentence for both Father and Son is found in John 1,1 and probably (following UBSGNT) in John 1,18. The problem of the exact meaning of 1,9b is not as important for the general thesis of this article as is the meaning of *ho theos* in v. 8. For a defense of taking *ho theos* as vocative in both v. 8 and v. 9, see BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 18-20.

⁽³⁴⁾ So, correctly, MOFFATT, *Hebrews*, 14. Some commentators claim the reference here is only to Christians; so, e.g., BONSIRVEN, *Épître*, 197; BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 21. MICHEL (*Brief*, 119) says the reference is first of all to human beings, but also allows a possible reference to angels. In favor of angels alone is HÉRING (*L'épître*, 26); MOFFATT, (*Hebrews*, 14, if our author has anything particular in mind); and THEISSEN (*Untersuchungen*, 101 n. 27). P. HUGHES (*Hebrews*, 66) is doubtful about imposing too precise a value on *metochous*. VANHOYE (*Situation*, 193-194) prefers an inclusive sense: all those associated with Christ in heaven, excluding neither angels nor Christians. But does that fit the problematic of Heb 1,5-14?

⁽³⁵⁾ So, citing this text, BAG, 616; likewise, M. ZERWICK-M. GROSVENOR, *A Grammatical Analysis of the Greek New Testament* (Rome 1981) 655.

angels. What was implicit in the *proskynēsatosan* of v. 6 becomes explicit in the *ho theos* of v. 8: the angels must adore the Son their Creator, because he is the eternal God⁽³⁶⁾.

(6) The sixth citation expands upon the divine status of the Son. One necessary corollary of being God is being the immutable Creator, as opposed to mutable and perishable creatures. This theme was already implied in 1,7; now it is clearly proclaimed. The constraints of a set OT text prevent any explicit reference to the angels in vv. 10-12, but they are obviously included in the *pantes* of v. 11.

We have already been told that the Son made the angels (*ho poiōn*, v. 7), and their mutability has been hinted at⁽³⁷⁾. The author now applies the words of LXX Ps 101,26-28 to the Son, who is accordingly addressed as *kyrie*, Lord⁽³⁸⁾. He was active in the beginning (*kai'archas*, reminiscent of John 1,1, *en archē*)⁽³⁹⁾, when he laid the foundations of the earth; the heavens, too, are the works of his hands. All creation therefore, proceeds from and depends on the preexistent Son. Since our author is here working under the con-

(36) Cf. the pointed summation of MONTEFIORE (*Hebrews*, 47): "... here [in Heb 1,8] the verse [of the psalm] is used to show the Son's superiority to the angels is based on his divine nature". One weakness of Thompson's exclusive emphasis on exaltation in the catena ("Structure", 133-138) is that he does not give much theological weight to the statements about the Son's eternal, divine preexistence. At times it sounds as though Thompson is saying that the Son becomes eternal and immutable only at the exaltation. That does not do full justice to the complex thought of our author in Hebrews 1. Contrast H. MACNEILL (*The Christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews* [Chicago 1914] 32-35, 49-51), who remarks that we would naturally want the author of Hebrews to be clearer "on what may be called the past eternity of Christ" (p. 51).

(37) The simple *kai* at the beginning of v. 10 also indicates that we simply have here a continuation of the contrast explicated by the introductory rubrics in v. 7a and v. 8a; cf. MOFFATT, *Hebrews*, 15.

(38) There is no equivalent to the LXX's *sy kyrie* in the MT Ps 102,26. B. W. BACON ("Heb 1,10-12 and the Septuagint Rendering of Ps 102,23", *ZNW* 3[1902]280-285) tries to explain our author's application of LXX Ps 101 to Christ by the changes the LXX translator made on the Hebrew text. BRUCE (*Hebrews*, 22) accepts Bacon's explanation, but VANHOYE's remarks (*Situation*, 199-203) are simpler and more satisfying.

(39) MICHEL (*Brief*, 121) suggests an echo of Gen 1,1. However, it should be stressed that neither here nor elsewhere in the Epistle is the Son ever explicitly called *ho logos*.

straints of the wording of the psalm, there is no reference to God the Father's act of creation *through* the Son, as in 1,2c⁽⁴⁰⁾. The Son is here the chief agent of creation, and in this the idea is somewhat closer to the Son's conservation of creation in 1,3b. The "qualitatively infinite" distance between Creator and creature is expressed by the stark, terse juxtaposition of v. 11a: "They shall perish, but you remain [or, shall remain]"⁽⁴¹⁾. Creation is subject to change and dissolution like a garment⁽⁴²⁾; "but you are the same" (*ho autos*; cf. 13,8, "Jesus Christ, the same [*ho autos*] yesterday and today and forever"). The final line in 1,12d, "and your years shall not fail [or, end]", is a fitting inclusion with 1,10a: "You, O Lord, in the beginning". Be it the beginning or the end of the visible creation, from protology to eschatology, the Son who is Creator is present, active, and unchanging. The sweep of the whole of creation's history, over which the Son presides in a timeless present (*ho autos ei*), is intimated by the movement through aorist (*ethemeliōsas*), present (*ei-sin*), and future (e.g., *apolountai*, *allagēsontai*). This, rather than a detailed concern with the apocalyptic events of the end-time, seems to be the main point of vv. 10-12⁽⁴³⁾.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ BUCHANAN (*Hebrews*, 22) misses this point. He claims that, if the *kyrie* does refer to Jesus, Jesus is being thought of "as a sort of demiurge through whom God created the heaven and earth as well as the ages (1,2,10)". This is correct for v. 2, but not for vv. 10-12. VANHOYE (*Situation*, 207) sees this well.

⁽⁴¹⁾ Since the original text carried no accent marks, one cannot be sure whether our author took *diameneis* as present or future; KISTEMAKER (*Psalms Citations*, 26) prefers the present. If we read the present, we have an interesting movement of ideas from preexistence and creation (*kat'archas... ethemeliōsas*), through timeless present (*diameneis... ho autos ei*) to endless future (*ta etē sou ouk ekleipsousin*). For the alternation of verbs and a possible concentric pattern, see VANHOYE, *Situation*, 198-199.

⁽⁴²⁾ For the insertion of *hōs himation* in Heb 1,12b, see METZGER, *Textual Commentary*, 663. The problem does not concern our investigation.

⁽⁴³⁾ THOMPSON ("Structure", 137) opposes MICHEL (*Brief*, 121), who sees in v. 11 a reference to apocalyptic catastrophes. It should be noted, though, that Michel says that the eschatological drama is only hinted at in Heb 1,10-12, while it is described at greater length in 12,26-29. Once again, Thompson sees 1,10-12 only as an "exaltation text" and plays down the references to a divine, immutable existence which precedes creation and therefore any act of exaltation. By contrast, VANHOYE (*Situation*, 194-207) emphasizes in vv. 10-12 the theme of the role of the exalted Christ at the end of the world. Indeed, on p. 226 he stresses that the whole of chap. 1 is drawn up from an

(7) The seventh and final citation brings us full circle. Having started with the naming of Christ as Son at his enthronement, as described in Ps 2,7 (Heb 1,5bc), we conclude with the Son's enthronement/exaltation as described in Ps 109,1⁽⁴⁴⁾. The two royal Davidic psalms of enthronement frame the whole catena. This inclusion is underlined by the fact that the seventh citation, like the first, begins with the rhetorical question: "For to which of the angels did he [God the Father] ever say...?"⁽⁴⁵⁾ As we have seen, Ps 109,1 supplies the starting point of our author's theological reflection. By connecting Ps 109,1 with Ps 109,4 and by drawing out the implications, he grounds his basic thesis: the exalted Son (Ps 109,1) is the eternal priest like Melchizedek (Ps 109,4). Heb 1,14 then supplies a conclusion to the catena and a transition to the first parenetic section (2,1-4)⁽⁴⁶⁾. The verse emphasizes for the last time that the Son, who is the heavenly enthroned king, is obviously superior to the angels. Far from being seated in power, like the Son, *all* the angels⁽⁴⁷⁾, as ministers (*leitourgika*, reminiscent of *leitourgous* in v.

eschatological perspective; again, the preexistence-motif is played down. I think instead that the major point of vv. 10-12 is the a-temporal, immutable existence of the Son, as seen in his creation of all things and his continued control over them as they change and disappear. In all this, there may be an echo of *pherōn te ta panta* (1,2), especially if *pherōn* does include the idea of governing all things and guiding them to their appointed goal.

(⁴⁴) Actually, the seventh citation is unique in not having a Christological title mentioned either in the introductory formula or in the OT text. By this time, it is not necessary. Both the inclusion with 1,5 (pointing to the title Son) and the well-known initial words of LXX Ps 109,1 ("the Lord said to my Lord") make it clear that the addressee is the Son and Lord addressed in the previous citations.

(⁴⁵) Cf. KISTEMAKER, *Psalm Citations*, 80. On p. 99, Kistemaker draws attention to the parallel between 1,13 and 1,3d; so too, BRUCE, *Hebrews*, 23.

(⁴⁶) VANHOYE (*Situation*, 220) observes that the author does not use another citation to enunciate the position of angels in v. 14. Instead, for the first time since the beginning of the paragraph (at 1,5), he himself composes a whole sentence. One wonders whether the author refrains from citing another OT text about the angels (of which there were many still available) precisely to keep the number of quotations at seven, thus matching the seven designations in 1,2-4.

(⁴⁷) Notice the *pantes* in v. 14, which recalls the *pantes aggeloi* of v. 6 and perhaps the *pantes* (which certainly has a wider reference than the angels but no doubt includes them) in v. 11; cf. P. HUGHES, *Hebrews*, 71.

7c), are sent to serve Christian believers, who are destined to inherit salvation (*klēronomein*, recalling *klēronomon* in v. 2b and *keklēronomēken* in v. 4). The *tous mellontas klēronomein* captures perfectly the Epistle's interplay of Christological-realized eschatology (especially in doctrinal sections) and ecclesiological-future eschatology (especially in parenetic sections). What the Son-become-man already is on the basis of the past act of exaltation (*hon ethēken klēronomon, keklēronomēken*), the believing community is called to be at the end of its pilgrimage towards the heavenly city (*tous mellontas klēronomein*)⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Before we proceed to a correlation of exordium and catena, we should pause to ask one question: Why is the whole catena—and in a sense, the whole of chap. 1—dedicated to showing that the Son is superior to the angels? Various suggestions have been made: the author is fighting a type of angel-worship seen also in Colossians⁽⁴⁹⁾, or he is countering a veneration of angelic priests or intercessors, reflected in some of the Dead Sea documents⁽⁵⁰⁾ and in other intertestamental literature (e.g., *T. Levi* 3,5; *T. Dan* 6,2; *1 Enoch* 9,3;15,2;39,5;40,6;47,2;89,76)⁽⁵¹⁾, or he is polemicizing against the

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Some commentators speculate on who the enemies mentioned in the citation of v. 13 are. Given the author's treatment of angels here and elsewhere (e.g., 12,22), they are certainly not the angels. More likely candidates are the devil and his power over men through fear of death (2,14-15), Christian apostates (10,26-31), and persecutors (10,32-39; 11,35-38; 12,1-12); see HOFIUS, *Christushymnus*, 99-100, as well as the earliest patristic interpretation, found in *1 Clem.* 36,6.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ So BORNKAMM, "Bekenntnis", 198 n. 22, against Käsemann; the idea is considered simply as a possibility by MOFFATT, *Hebrews*, 9.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ H.-M. SCHENKE ("Erwägungen zum Rätsel des Hebräerbriefes", *Neues Testament und Christliche Existenz* [Tübingen 1973]421-437) suggests a link with a type of merkabah mysticism reflected in 11Q Melch. For a full treatment of this document in reference to the NT in general and Hebrews in particular, see P. KOBELSKI, *Melchizedek and Melchireša'* (Washington, D.C. 1981). P. HUGHES (*Hebrews*, 52-53) suggests that the Hebrew Christians to whom the author is writing have been influenced by teachings similar to those held by the "Dead Sea Sect". According to these teachings, both of the Messiahs would be subordinate to the Archangel Michael; hence the necessity to "demonstrate the supremacy of Christ over all angelic beings".

⁽⁵¹⁾ All these texts may be conveniently found in R. CHARLES, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English. Volume 2: Pseudepigrapha* (Oxford 1913). For a more recent edition of Enoch, see M.

idea of multiple intermediaries with interchangeable functions, an idea which was widespread in middle platonism and is seen in Philo⁽⁵²⁾. Others would rather explain the concern in terms of a scene of royal enthronement, with the angels as the court audience⁽⁵³⁾. In connection with this, some would even see the three steps of an Egyptian enthronement ritual in the catena of 1,5-14⁽⁵⁴⁾. Some of these suggestions, such as the Egyptian enthronement ceremony, seem farfetched⁽⁵⁵⁾. While other suggestions cannot be categorically

KNIBB, *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch. 2. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford 1978). For a more recent edition of the Testaments, see *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum* (ed. M. de JONGE) (Leiden 1964). In this "editio minima" of de Jonge, the key texts read as follows. *T. Levi* 3,5: *en tō met'auton hoi aggeloi eisi tou prosōpou kyriou, hoi leitourgountes kai exilaskomenoi pros kyrion epi pasais tais agnoiais tōn dikaiōn. Prospherousi de kyriō osmēn euōdias logikēn kai anaimakton prosphoran.* *T. Dan.* 6,2: *eggizete de tō theō kai tō aggelō tō paraitoumenō hymas hoti houtos esti mesitēs theou kai anthrōpōn epi tēs eirēnēs Israēl.* In individual cases, notably in the *T. Levi*, there are disputes over possible Christian interpolations or even Christian authorship; see, e.g., M. DE JONGE, "Notes on Testament of Levi II-VII", *Studies on the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (ed. M. DE JONGE) (Leiden 1975) 247-260. But the similar ideas from Qumran and from Tobit (12,11-15) prove that such motifs were known in Judaism in the first centuries B.C. and A.D.

⁽⁵²⁾ Cf. DEY, *Intermediary World*, 127, 146-147.

⁽⁵³⁾ So KÄSEMANN, *Gottesvolk*, 60; GRÄSSER, "Hebräer, 1,1-4", 226.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ The pattern is explained by E. NORDEN, *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig 1924) 116-128. The three acts comprise the elevation of the king to divine life, the presentation of the new god to the circle of the heavenly beings, and the enthronement. Relying on Norden, SCHIERSE (*Verheissung*, 96 n. 100) claims that the ritual pattern is found in Heb 1,5-14. One of the great popularizers of this three-step pattern is J. Jeremias; see his *Jesus' Promise to the Nations* (London 1958) 38; and *Die Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (Göttingen 1968) 23-25. The idea has been accepted, at times with variations, by SPICQ (*L'épître*, 2,23), MICHEL (*Brief*, 109 n. 1, 116-117), and R. MARTIN (*Carmen Christi* [Cambridge 1967] 243-244).

⁽⁵⁵⁾ See, e.g., the criticism by HOFIUS, *Christushymnus*, 30, 89 n. 60. Whether we can reconstruct all the steps of an Egyptian enthronement ritual which supposedly remained basically the same throughout the centuries, to what degree this ritual influenced the enthronement ritual of Israelite kings, whether indeed we can reconstruct the exact steps of the Israelite ritual, and finally whether this ritual pattern would have been known to a first-century Christian author are all questions that are rarely asked. See the sober remarks by O. KEEL, *The Symbolism of the Biblical World* (NY 1978) 256. I think that seeing three distinct steps of an enthronement ritual in Heb 1,5-14

denied (e.g., a polemic against syncretistic or gnosticizing ideas about angels and their priestly functions)⁽⁵⁶⁾, the major reason for the stress on the superiority of the Son to the angels is best seen in the internal logic of the Epistle's argument. The son's superiority grounds the first exhortation, in 2,1-4. In an *a fortiori* (or *qal wahomer*) argument, our author reasons that, if the Mosaic revelation, mediated through angels, had such fearful sanctions, how much more fearful is the punishment that awaits those who neglect the definitive revelation and salvation offered in the Son. The Son's superiority to the angels is simply the first in a series of *a fortiori* arguments. Moses, Joshua (by implication), and the Jewish high priests all suffer the same fate. Indeed, if we grasp that the whole purpose of chap. 1 is to ground the claim that the Son is the supreme revealer-and-revelation, even the quasi-metaphysical designation in 1,3a takes on a salvation-historical function. He who is eternally the effulgence of God's glory and the image of his substance is alone the adequate revealer and content of revelation⁽⁵⁷⁾.

Having investigated the meaning of each of the seven citations, we are now in a position to say something about the movement of thought in the catena as a whole. As I pointed out earlier in this

takes more than a little imagination. If the seven texts were re-ordered in various combinations, I do not doubt that some would see the same three steps of exaltation, presentation, and enthronement. The fact that the seventh citation in 1,13 simply returns to the theme of enthronement of the Son struck in 1,3 makes a pattern of three progressive steps most unlikely.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ One objection against the presence in chap. 1 of a polemic concerning angels performing liturgical functions is the author's willingness to use *leitourgous* (v. 7) and *leitourgika* (v. 14) of the angels in the very chapter in which he is arguing for the Son's superiority to them. Granted, these Greek words are by no means limited to a "liturgical" or cultic meaning, and our author does not intend such a sense in chap. 1. But these words are open to a cultic meaning, as our author knows full well (cf. 8,2.6;9,21;10,11). If his precise purpose in chap. 1 had been to attack the idea that the angels fulfilled liturgical functions, I think he would have avoided terminology that could have played directly into the hands of his supposed opponents.

⁽⁵⁷⁾ In favor of understanding the argument over angels as an argument over the superior revelation given through the Son are MACNEILL, *Christology*, 36-37; O. KUSS, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (Regensburg 1953)22-23; G. HUGHES, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, 7-8; and THOMPSON, "Structure", 139. As M. D'ANGELO observes (*Moses in the Letter to the Hebrews* [Missoula 1979]260), such a revelation-Christology brings us very close to the position of the fourth gospel, especially John 1,18.

article, the blocks of quotations, drawn from fixed texts, can hardly enunciate the neat, precise, terse schema of the author's own composition in 1,2b-4. Yet a certain general pattern does emerge. The author's Christological thought does begin with and emphasize exaltation (1,5-6, the first three citations). With the fourth citation (v. 7), one hears the first hint of the idea that the Son is superior to the angels because he creates them—if *ho poiōn* may be taken in that weighty theological sense, a sense *epoiēsen* certainly has in v. 2c. In v. 8b the fifth citation begins with and emphasizes the divinity of the Son (*ho theos*) and the eternity of his rule. The subsequent lines in v. 9 may refer to Christ's earthly life and exaltation, but such a reference is not certain. The sixth citation begins in v. 10 by emphasizing the creative activity of the Son in the beginning (*kat'archas... ethemeliōsas*), a creative activity which continues into the present (*erga tōn cheirōn sou eisin hoi ouranoi*, v. 10b), an activity which will continue as the Son guides the old creation to its appointed goal of dissolution (vv. 11-12), while the Creator himself knows no change or diminution (*diameneis, ho autos ei, ouk ekleipsousin*). Finally, the seventh citation brings us back to the theme of enthronement (v. 13), illumined by a concluding comment of our author, who contrasts the Son's royal status with the inferior position of the angels as servants (v. 14).

I would therefore maintain that, while the correspondence is not one-for-one, there is a general symmetry between the movement of thought in the seven Christological designations in Heb 1,2b-4 and the movement of thought in the seven OT citations in 1,5-14. In each case, the train of thought begins with Christ's exaltation (1,2b; 1,5-6), moves back to creation (1,2c; 1,7), moves "farther back" to preexistence, divinity, and eternal rule (1,3a; 1,8bc), moves forward again to creation as well as governance and guidance of creation (1,3b; 1,10-12), moves all the way up to exaltation again (1,3d; 1,13), and draws a final conclusion comparing Christ's exalted status to the angels' inferior role (1,4; 1,14). The ring closes where it opened. Needless to say, the symmetry is not perfect in every detail. The reference to the Son's "purifying from sin" (1,3c) finds no correlative in the seven citations⁽⁵⁸⁾, perhaps because the OT quota-

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Heb 1,9a might be a candidate, but as we have seen the reference is too vague and the value of the tenses too problematic. The same is true of 9bc.

tions are focused solely on the Son's status vis-à-vis the angels, while purification from sin concerns human beings. But, seen as a whole, the two "cycles of seven" do seem to correspond in the general movement of their Christological thought. The whole of chap. 1 is thus a monument to our author's ability to weld together OT citations and NT kerygma, literary structure and Christological thought.

II. A Traditional Hymn in 1,1-4?

There is, I think, a significant corollary to the symmetry we have investigated. The corollary concerns the traditional hymn which many exegetes find somewhere within Heb 1,1-4. So widespread is this opinion today that G. Hughes can speak of a "wide consensus that material from older and different sources has been incorporated [into 1,2-4]"⁽⁵⁹⁾. Besides Hughes, this opinion is favored, with varying degrees of certitude and nuance, by E. Norden⁽⁶⁰⁾, G. Bornkamm⁽⁶¹⁾, E. Grässer⁽⁶²⁾, O. Hofius⁽⁶³⁾, U. Luck⁽⁶⁴⁾, R. Martin⁽⁶⁵⁾, K. Wengst⁽⁶⁶⁾, R. Deichgräber⁽⁶⁷⁾, J. T. Sanders⁽⁶⁸⁾, and J. Thompson⁽⁶⁹⁾. Most speak in general terms of traditional material or a set hymn, while Bornkamm also terms the tradition a confessional formula (*Bekenntnis*)⁽⁷⁰⁾. Most of these writers admit,

⁽⁵⁹⁾ G. HUGHES, *Hebrews and Hermeneutics*, 6.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ E. NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos* (Stuttgart 1913; reprint 1956) 380-387, especially 386.

⁽⁶¹⁾ BORNKAMM, "Bekenntnis", 197-199.

⁽⁶²⁾ GRÄSSER, "Hebräer 1,1-4", 190-198, 225.

⁽⁶³⁾ HOFIUS, *Christushymnus*, 80-87.

⁽⁶⁴⁾ U. LUCK, "Himmlisches und irdisches Geschehen im Hebräerbrief", *NT* 6(1963) 200.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ MARTIN, *Carmen Christi*, 19, 305 n. 8; Martin never commits himself explicitly to a traditional hymn in Heb 1,1-4.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ K. WENGST, *Christologische Formeln und Lieder des Urchristentums* (Gütersloh 1972) 166-167.

⁽⁶⁷⁾ R. DEICHGRÄBER, *Gotteshymnus und Christushymnus in der frühen Christenheit* (Göttingen 1967) 137-40.

⁽⁶⁸⁾ J. T. SANDERS, *The New Testament Christological Hymns* (Cambridge 1971) 19.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ THOMPSON, "Structure", 129.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ DEICHGRÄBER (*Gotteshymnus*, 137 n. 2) rejects Bornkamm's label of *Bekenntnis* in favor of the designation "Christ-hymn".

however, that it is difficult to delimit the hymnic tradition precisely. For instance, many agree that, while v. 4 contains traditional material, it has been redacted by the author of Hebrews.

Verse 4 is indeed a good place to begin our investigation of the "wide consensus". Taking the opposite side of the argument, I claim that there is no indication of traditional material in v. 4. The vocabulary, structure, and thought are all typical of our author, as has already been shown in my previous article. The *synkrisis*, expressed by *tosoutō*. . . *hosō*, or some similar construction, occurs elsewhere (e.g., 7,20,22; 8,6; 10,25). *Diaphoros* occurs four times in the NT, three of which are in Hebrews (1,4; 8,6 [*diaphorōteras*]; 9,10). *Kreittōn* occurs nineteen times in the NT, thirteen of which are in Hebrews, which regularly uses it to express the superiority of the new economy of salvation. The words of inheritance (*klēronomos*, *keklēronomēken*, *klēronomein*) act as a repetition to stitch together 1,2.4.14; they also occur, in various forms, in 6,12.17; 9,15; 11,7.8; 12,17. The preposition *para* occurs ten times in Hebrews; *ginomai* occurs thirty times. *Onoma* occurs four times in Hebrews, and here supplies the pivotal theme for the string of titles and designations in the catena. Indeed, the whole of v. 4, with its enunciation of the thesis of the superiority of Christ to the angels, supplies the "superscription" for 1,5-14. In short, there is not a shred of evidence in favor of attributing v. 4 to a traditional hymn. To say that our author has heavily redacted the hymn in v. 4 is to assert the unprovable and to avoid the simpler explanation. The supposed "hymnic character"⁽⁷¹⁾ of v. 4 simply reminds us that our author is a fine stylist capable of writing elevated, rhythmic prose⁽⁷²⁾.

Having failed to find a traditional fragment in v. 4, let us go to the other end of the supposed hymn, 2b or 2c. Here too, exegetes are vague in their comments, many saying that v. 2 contains traditional material, but material taken from a source different from the hymn they discern in v. 3. Again, this assertion is without foundation. Every single word in 1,2bc occurs elsewhere in Hebrews, as

(71) So DEICHGRÄBER (*Gotteshymnus*, 138), though he qualifies the description with "zum Teil". He argues for tradition from the parallel mention of the conferral of a name in the Philippians hymn.

(72) So, e.g., NORDEN, *Agnostos Theos*, 386; GRÄSSER, "Hebräer 1,1-4", 190 n. 58.

do certain key concepts: Christ as heir (1,4), Christ as Creator (1,10), the use of *aiōn* in the plural in the context of creation by the word of God (11,3). The presence of relative clauses does not in itself indicate traditional material or hymns, as Grässer readily admits⁽⁷³⁾. Especially in such a refined writer as the author of Hebrews, carefully constructed relative clauses, marked by rhythm and sometimes interwoven with participles, are to be expected; as a matter of fact, they are found elsewhere in the Epistle (e.g., 1,1-4.10.14-15; 4,12-13; 5,5-10; 7,26-27; 8,1-2; 9,6-10.11-12; 10,19-22.24-25). True, a relative clause that has no grammatical antecedent or that breaks the context may indicate the insertion of traditional material (e.g., 1 Tim 3,16). But in Heb 1,2 the relative pronouns have an obvious antecedent in *huiq̄* and do not disturb the line of thought. Once again, there is not a shred of evidence for a traditional hymn or confessional formula in 1,2.

This leaves us with 1,3, which indeed is the one verse on which all of the above-named authors agree when they try to delimit the traditional hymn. Some, in fact, limit the original hymn to v. 3 alone⁽⁷⁴⁾. So certain is Deichgräber on this point that he boldly affirms that v. 3 was taken over by the author of the Epistle without additions⁽⁷⁵⁾. Nevertheless, as we examine the arguments in favor of a hymn in 1,3, we get a sense of *déjà vu*: many of them have been already discredited in our treatment of v. 4 and v. 2. Rhythm, elevated prose, complicated constructions involving relative pronouns and participles—all these are the stock and trade of a rhetorician like our author, especially in an exordium. The relative *hos*, like *hon* and *di'hou* before it, has a clear antecedent in *huiq̄*. Realizing this, Grässer emphasizes the argument from unique or rare words in v. 3⁽⁷⁶⁾. Actually, there are two NT *hapax legomena* in 1,3a: *apaugasma* and *charaktēr*. However, since all scholars admit that the author of Hebrews reflects the Jewish-Hellenistic intellectual milieu of Alexandria (*apaugasma* in Wis 7,26; both words in Philo), the simplest explanation is that he is drawing upon the vocabulary

(73) GRÄSSER, "Hebräer 1,1-4", 192,194.

(74) WENGST, *Christologische Formeln*, 166; MARTIN, *Carmen Christi*, 19.

(75) DEICHGRÄBER, *Gottes hymnus*, 137.

(76) GRÄSSER, "Hebräer 1,1-4", 194-195; he also appeals to the parallels with other NT Christological hymns.

of his general religious background rather than on some otherwise unknown and undemonstrable Christian hymn. Put simply: *apau-gasma* and *charaktēr* do occur in Jewish Alexandrian literature; they do not occur in any NT hymn. The choice of the more likely background seems clear. Almost all the other words in 1,3 occur elsewhere in Hebrews. *Katharismos* does not occur again, though *katharizō*, *katharos*, and *katharotēs* do, in contexts of ritual or spiritual cleansing. And, by common admission, 1,3c expresses a key concern of the author throughout the Epistle. Indeed, v. 3c and v. 3d, taken together, give the clearest expression within the exordium of the theme of the whole work. Even v. 3a and v. 3b, with their themes of divinity, preexistence, and continuous creative activity, are echoed in 1,7-12 and ultimately ground the claim of the superiority of Christ's revelation in 2,1-4.

To support the presence of hymnic material, Deichgräber appeals to the clear break between 1,2 (with God as the subject) and 1,3 (with the Son as the subject)⁽⁷⁷⁾. But this is to miss the subtle shift of thought engineered by the author throughout vv. 1-3. In v. 1 God is the subject who reveals, without any reference to the Son. In v. 2, the Son is first mentioned as the mediator of revelation, redemption, and creation, while God still remains the subject and principal agent. In v. 3, the Son becomes the principal agent, while God is mentioned *in obliquo* by pronouns (*autou*) or pious periphrasis (*doxēs*, *megalōsynēs*). By a carefully constructed slant in the movement of thought and language, theo-logy gradually becomes christo-logy. What Deichgräber calls a clear break is rather a clever and smooth progression.

A final argument in favor of a traditional hymn is the close similarity between the movement of thought in Heb 1,1-4 and the kind of Christology in the hymns found in Phil 2,6-11, Col 1,15-20, and 1 Tim 3,16. But all this need show is that our author comes out of a Christian background formed by Jewish and Jewish-Christian speculation on Wisdom and is acquainted with Christological traditions reflected in the hymns which use the Wisdom myth. This in no way proves that he is citing one particular Christian hymn, known or unknown. In sum, while the arguments for a traditional hymn may look more substantial in v. 3 than in v. 4 or v. 2, they are still too weak to convince.

(77) DEICHGRÄBER, *Gotteshymnus*, 138.

Moreover, I would maintain that the thesis of the present article supplies an additional argument against the consensus favoring a traditional hymn in the exordium. As we have seen, our author has carefully constructed a symmetrical pattern embracing the seven Christological designations in the exordium and the seven OT citations in the catena. Moreover, the symmetry is not only formal-numerical but also material-theological. Each group of seven moves in the same general ring-like pattern: from exaltation back to creation, back farther to divinity/preexistence, forward again to creation and guidance of creation, and forward still farther to exaltation and superiority to the angels. It strains credulity to imagine that a traditional hymn (whatever its extent), inserted into the exordium, just happened to fit perfectly into this numerical and theological symmetry. To explain such a neat fit one must again appeal to heavy redactional activity by our author. Indeed, for such a snug fit, the redactional activity would have to be so heavy that the supposed traditional material would, for all practical purposes, disappear into the composition of the author of the Epistle. We are left wondering why anyone would insist on expending so much time and effort on such a weak hypothesis when the simpler solution is also the obvious one: Heb 1,1-4 is the composition of our author, from start to finish⁽⁷⁸⁾.

III. Conclusions

We can now bring this article to an end by marshaling our conclusions and adding some corollaries.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ This position, while definitely a minority one, is not without its supporters. D. ROBINSON ("The Literary Structure of Hebrews 1,1-4", *AJBA* 2[1972]178-186) argues against the hymn on structural grounds. Unfortunately, the structures Robinson discerns in Heb 1 are highly questionable. He follows Bruce in counting seven "facts about Christ" in 1,2-3, thus amputating v. 4 from a literary structure and a thought-unit to which it clearly belongs. The seven-fold pattern is dismissed as unimportant, and no connection with the pattern of seven psalms is seen. The chiasm he discerns in vv. 2b-3 is artificially constructed. J. FRANKOWSKI ("Early Christian Hymns Recorded in the New Testament", *BZ* 27[1983]183-194) also rejects a traditional hymn in v. 3; he thinks that the verse was freely composed by our author from Christological motifs well known in the first century.

(1) The view that the author of Hebrews is both a consummate stylist and a profound theologian is confirmed by a structural analysis of the first chapter. More specifically, we have seen that the author creates two "cycles of seven": seven Christological predication or designations in 1,2b-4 and seven OT citations grounding the Christological predication in 1,5-14.

(2) The symmetry, however, is not purely numerical. There is also a global parallel as regards the movement of Christological thought in the seven designations and in the catena of citations. In 1,2b-4, the thought moves in a "ring-structure" backwards and then forwards again. Starting with the exaltation of the Son, the author moves back to creation, back farther to eternal preexistence, forward again to conservation and guidance of creation, purification from sins, exaltation/enthronement, and consequent superiority to the angels. A similar theological "ring-structure" is visible in the catena: exaltation as Son, back to creation (specifically, of angels), back to divinity and timeless existence, forward to creation, to exaltation/enthronement, and to a concluding remark of the author about the inferiority of angels to the Son. The parallel is not a perfect one-to-one correspondence of each designation to the numerically equivalent citation; it is rather a general correspondence in the themes and movement of thought. Granted the numerical symmetry of the two lists of seven's, the symmetry in thought hardly seems accidental. Weaving together numerical structure and theology at the very beginning of his presentation, the author may be subtly indicating, by a kind of "Christological rhetoric", the perfection (*teleiôtēs*) that the Son has achieved—seven being the number of perfection⁽⁷⁹⁾.

(3) If the author of Hebrews himself has carefully composed the numerical and theological symmetry we have found in Hebrews 1, then two well-known theses that touch on this chapter are called into question. G. Theissen has tried to claim that *1 Clement* 36 represents independent Christian tradition and so is literarily independent

(⁷⁹) The importance of the concept of perfection to the Epistle to the Hebrews need not be documented here; see PETERSON, *Hebrews and Perfection*, with its bibliography on pp. 294-304; also MICHEL, *Brief*, 225-229; SPICQ, *L'épître*, 2, 214-230. From all that we have seen, it is difficult to agree with Spicq (2, 2) that the seven Christological designations in 1,2-4 are "without order". It is simply a question of understanding that the author's order is not our order.

of Heb 1. He supports part of his thesis by presuming a traditional hymn in Hebrews 1 which is also reflected in *1 Clement* 36⁽⁸⁰⁾. The rejection of any traditional hymn in Heb 1,2-4 notably weakens his thesis and makes the literary dependence of *1 Clement* 36 on Heb 1 much more likely. Indeed, if one decides that the whole of Heb 1 is the composition of our author, it seems almost impossible to deny that the writer of *1 Clement* knew the Epistle to the Hebrews. *1 Clement* 36 is simply too close in language and thought to Hebrews 1⁽⁸¹⁾.

A similar conclusion must be reached about the thesis of those authors who explain the seven citations in Heb 1,5-14 as coming from some testimony-book. The seven citations and their precise order fit too neatly into the schema of Hebrews 1 to be taken *en bloc* from a book of OT citations⁽⁸²⁾. In particular, those who argue that a testimony-book must have been used because the OT citations fit so poorly into the literary and theological context of the Epistle⁽⁸³⁾ have failed to understand the catena's true function.

(4) The fact that both ring-structures begin and end with exaltation confirms the thesis of J. Thompson that exaltation is the vantage point of the catena⁽⁸⁴⁾ —and indeed, the vantage point of the whole of chap. 1 and of the author's theology. It seems to me, however, that Thompson's stress on exaltation prevents him from doing full justice to the statements about the Son's role in creation,

⁽⁸⁰⁾ THEISSEN, *Untersuchungen*, 50.

⁽⁸¹⁾ So G. COCKERILL, "Heb 1,1-4, 1 Clem. 36,1-6 and the High Priest Title", *JBL* 97(1978)437-440. Cockerill points out the background of Theissen's position in the work of Käsemann, Grässer, and Schierse. See also P. ELLINGWORTH, "Hebrews and 1 Clement: Literary Dependence or Common Tradition?", *BZ* 23(1979)262-269. Ellingworth basically agrees with Cockerill.

⁽⁸²⁾ So MONTEFIORE (*Hebrews*, 43), who tries to distinguish between the original meaning of the citations in the traditional catena and the redactional meaning in Hebrews. The results are highly speculative. Even more speculative is the claim of F. SYNGE (*Hebrews and the Scriptures* [London 1959] 53) that the author of Hebrews "has no notion where [in the Bible] his citations come from", since he is quoting from a testimony-book.

⁽⁸³⁾ So HAY, *Glory*, 39, in support of Theissen. Against the theory of a testimony-book behind Hebrews 1 is GRÄSSER, "Hebräer 1,1-4", 208-209.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ The position is enunciated clearly on p. 129 of Thompson's "Structure".

his divinity, and his preexistence⁽⁸⁵⁾. In saying this, I do not mean to deny that the author's dominant viewpoint throughout the Epistle is exaltation. But from that vantage point the author does look back to creation and preexistence and does speak, mythologically of course, of those "events" or "stages". They do play a role in his total theological vision, although the emphasis is elsewhere.

(5) The fact that the Son's divinity, preexistence, and role in creation do have a place in the author's theology poses a difficulty for the thesis of J. Dunn in his excellent work, *Christology in the Making*⁽⁸⁶⁾. Along with some other recent scholars, Dunn claims that there is no affirmation of a real, personal preexistence of Christ before John's gospel⁽⁸⁷⁾. Dunn's radical thesis is refreshing, and forces one to rethink a great deal of what NT exegesis often takes for granted. I am not convinced, though, when Dunn claims that the Epistle to the Hebrews affirms something like OT Wisdom theology. Wisdom is simply the personification of God's activity in the world, says Dunn; and Hebrews simply says that this divine Wisdom became embodied in the person of Christ. It does not seem to me that such a position adequately describes the Christology of Hebrews. I do not think it irrelevant that all seven Christological designations depend directly or indirectly on *huiō* in 1,2a. The Son in and by whom God spoke historically "in these last days" (v. 2a) is then said, *first of all*, to be enthroned as heir at his exaltation (v. 2b), *then* to be the mediator of creation (v. 2c), *then* to be of eternal divine status (v. 3a), *then* to conserve and guide all creation (v. 3b), *then* to have purged sins (by his death and entrance into heaven, v. 3c), *then* to have sat down in heaven (v. 3d) as one greater than the angels (v. 4). Surely Dunn would not dispute that the author of Hebrews thought of the exalted Son, the dying Son, and the enthroned Son as the same real person, despite the different stages of his "career" and despite his different metaphysical "locations" (heaven or earth). Indeed, Dunn, like Thompson, stresses

⁽⁸⁵⁾ See, e.g., THOMPSON, "Structure", 133-138.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ J. DUNN, *Christology in the Making* (Philadelphia 1980) especially pp. 206-209 for Heb 1,1-3. It should be noted that Dunn seems to accept the hymn-hypothesis, at least for 1,3, possibly for v. 2b; see p. 338 n. 194.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ DUNN, *Christology*, 249: "...the Fourth Evangelist was the first Christian writer to conceive of the personal pre-existence of the Logos-Son...".

that "the author is thinking primarily of the exalted Christ"⁽⁸⁸⁾. With this I agree. But is there any reason to believe that, *in the mind of this first-century Christian author*, stages 2, 3, and 4 (vv. 2c, 3a, and 3b) involve a purely "ideal" figure, a personification of God's activity or (in Philo) God's mind, rather than the real person of stages 1, 5, 6, and 7 (vv. 2b, 3c, 3d, and 4)? The flow of the ring-structure does not seem to give any basis for such a differentiation between "ideal" and "real" existence. For this middle-platonic Christian theologian, what is in heaven is supremely real, be it the exalted Son or the preexistent Son. Consequently, I cannot agree with Dunn's judgment on Heb 1,1-3: "The thought of pre-existence is present, but in terms of Wisdom christology it is the act and power of God which properly speaking is what pre-exists; Christ is not so much the pre-existent act and power of God as its eschatological embodiment"⁽⁸⁹⁾.

I think my interpretation of Christ's preexistence in Heb 1,1-4 is confirmed by the catena of OT citations. Our author presents God (the Father) as addressing the Son directly in the second person singular in 1,5bc (*huios mou ei sy, egō sēmeron gegennēka se*; similarly in 1,13). Without any indication of a change in the nature of the address, God is said to use the same second person singular in addressing the preexistent Son in 1,8 (*hō thronos sou, hō theos*) and in v. 10 (*sy kat'archas, kyrie, tēn gēn ethemeliōsas*). There is no indication here that our author is merely indulging in poetic personification or that he is distinguishing between the Son's "ideal" and "real" existence. Reciprocally, the same Son who can speak to God "in the day of his flesh" (5,7), and who can plead before God for us now in his exalted state (7,25), can also speak to God as he (the Son) enters the world at his incarnation (10,5-10). It seems to me that Dunn's distinction of the ideal and real existence of Christ is a modern *hermeneutical* distinction, made to aid the modern mind as it grapples with the implications of Hebrews' theology. That is a legitimate hermeneutical undertaking. But the prior, more narrow, *exegetical* question must first be faced: Did the author of Hebrews, thinking and writing in the first century A.D., conceive of the pre-existent Son as a real person in his preexistence? I think that, when

⁽⁸⁸⁾ DUNN, *Christology*, 208.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ DUNN, *Christology*, 209.

the question is posed in this specific way, the data of the Epistle favor an affirmative answer. As Williamson never tires of saying, the author of Hebrews did not take over all of Philo's theology when he took over certain words and phrases and—as Thompson would add—certain metaphysical assumptions. In Hebrews, the middle platonism of Philo is fused with Christian faith-traditions concerning a concrete, historical figure, Jesus of Nazareth, who had lived perhaps not more than a half-century before our author wrote. The fusion of middle platonism with the Jesus-traditions produced a theological *novum* that broke old categories and world-views. Thompson is quite correct in seeing in Hebrews “the beginnings of Christian philosophy”. In short, I do not think that Dunn has completely grasped the *novum* of Hebrews. But then, has anyone? The present article has simply tried to make a very modest contribution to the ongoing task of grasping the most subtle and recondite mind in the NT.

Box 39, Curley Hall
Catholic University
Washington, D.C. 20064

John P. MEIER

SOMMAIRE

Nous basant sur notre article précédent («Structure and Theology in Heb 1,1-14», *Bib* 66 [1985] 168-189), nous examinons à présent les sept citations vétéro-testamentaires de He 1,5-14 afin de discerner le modèle de pensée théologique présent dans cette péricope. Bien qu'il n'y ait pas correspondance point par point avec les vv. 2b-4, le mouvement général est le même: exaltation, retour à la création et à la préexistence; plus avant de nouveau, conduite et gouvernement de la création, exaltation, et finalement son résultat.

Cette nette correspondance rend fort suspecte la prétention selon laquelle 1,1-4 renferme une hymne traditionnelle. L'ensemble de 1,1-4 est composé par l'auteur de l'épître. Plutôt que de chercher des hymnes traditionnelles dans le chap. 1, on devrait envisager ce chapitre comme un stimulant pour la réflexion théologique sur une christologie de la préexistence.

The Riddle of Samson (Judg 14,14.18)

Although the history of the reception of Samson's riddle (Judg 14,14.18) within the Jewish and Christian traditions underlines its brilliancy, a convincing interpretation has not yet been given. Unnecessary intricacies that adhere to certain attempts to solve the riddle have often resulted from a procedure that deviates too quickly from the level of textual expression. The interpretation that I propose results from a synchronic approach in which priority is given to the manner of textual expression. The remarks on the riddle itself do not follow from a preconceived definition of the riddle. The context and structural function of Samson's riddle will receive priority in my views and analysis of this particular riddle. A synthesis of the occurrences of the lexeme *hîdâ* in the Old Testament seems of little value as a working hypothesis. I find, however, the typification of the riddle by A. Jolles⁽¹⁾ and H.-P. Müller⁽²⁾ helpful in many respects. But the riddle of Samson does not fit exclusively into one of their categories.

It is deducible from the episodic structure of the Samson narrative (Judg 13-16) that the Yahwistic writer⁽³⁾ intended to develop a particular motif instead of factual history. The structure of Chapter 14 should be evaluated accordingly. The spacial shifts (from Zorah and Timnath) are so conflicting that they can hardly be considered as historical. But these movements, as used by the narrator, are strategically effective in creating a progression of motif and plot. The incidence of spacial transits brings important motivational aspects into the foreground. Without this strategic ploy Chapter 14 and the rest of the Samson story fall apart. According to J. Blen-

(¹) A. JOLLES, *Einfache Formen* (Tübingen 1982) 126-149.

(²) H.-P. MÜLLER, "Der Begriff 'Rätsel' im Alten Testament", *VT* 20 (1970) 465-489.

(³) Cf. O. EISSFELDT, *Die Quellen des Richterbuches in synoptischer Anordnung ins Deutsche übersetzt* (Leipzig 1925) 81-87 and C. A. SIMPSON, *Composition of the Book of Judges* (Oxford 1957) 53.

kinsopp⁽⁴⁾ the plot-structure revolves around an explicitly religious theme, that of the broken vow. Taking into account the prominent position of the cultural conflict between the Israelites and Philistines in this narrative, one is obliged to broaden Blenkinsopp's view of the plot. The cultural differences between the Israelites and the Philistines, as well as Israel's inferior position, are the most basic characteristics of the Samson narrative⁽⁵⁾. The real plot is constituted by Yahwism versus Philistine culture and power. The complexities of the main character, depicted as the nazirite (hero) and anti-nazirite (anti-hero), are developed within the overriding plot-structure as a secondary plot with its own sequential climax. This contrasting role of the main character is, however, embedded and integrated within the major plot-structure⁽⁶⁾.

During one of Samson's journeys to Timnath (14,5-10) he tore a lion (riddle motif) to pieces. On yet another occasion he found a swarm of bees and honey (riddle motif) in the carcass; and honey was a most desirable commodity.

During the traditional "bachelor-party" at the home of his bride's parents (contrary to Israelite custom), Samson entered into a contest to prove both his physical and mental abilities. These kinds of win-or-lose contests formed an integral part of the wedding party⁽⁷⁾. The consequence of such party-contests were often a catastrophe for the participants. In a competitive spirit Samson proposed his riddle (Judg 14,14). The conditions of this riddle leave no doubt as to the seriousness of the situation. Samson's riddle can in this respect be correctly classified as a "Halsrätsel"⁽⁸⁾.

⁽⁴⁾ "Structure and Style in Judges 13-16", *JBL* 82 (1963) 65-66.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. H. GUNKEL, "Simson", *Reden und Aufsätze* (Göttingen 1913) 39-41: "Diese Kulturüberlegenheit der Philister ist dann auch offenbar der Grund gewesen, weshalb sie den Israeliten der älteren Zeit so gefährlich gewesen sind... Doch von diesen politischen Dingen ist in der Simsongeschichte keine Rede...".

⁽⁶⁾ The characterization of Samson as a "Naturmensch" who triumphs over civilized society, as is assumed by H. Gunkel, "Simson", 42, is the result of his interpretation of the major part of the Samson narrative as a "Märchen".

⁽⁷⁾ It is most likely that the riddle has its original *Sitz im Leben* at such wedding parties, cf., e.g., L. RÖHRICH, "Rätsel", *RGK* 5 (3. Aufl. 1961) 767.

⁽⁸⁾ A. JOLLES, *Einfache Formen*, 132-133. For discussion and further literature, cf. H.-P. MÜLLER, "Der Begriff 'Rätsel'", 470.

Although Judg 14,18 is often rejected as the solution to the riddle (Judg 14,14), both verses are cited below for purposes of discussion.

Riddle: v. 14a	מאכל	יצא	מהאכל
	מתוק	יצא	ומעז
Solution: v. 18a	מדבש	מתוק	מה
	מארי	עז	ומה

Out of the eater came something to eat;
 out of the strong came something sweet.
 What is sweeter than honey?
 What is stronger than a lion?

In order to put my own analysis into perspective, a brief summary of the major trends of interpretation is given.

The most unsatisfactory explanation results from a procedure in which the sequence of historical events becomes so important that the complexities of the riddle itself are minimized, if not totally overlooked⁽⁹⁾.

The unaccountable coherence of vv. 14 and 18 has given Tur Sinai cause for total scepticism that a riddle even exists in this instance⁽¹⁰⁾. G. F. Moore⁽¹¹⁾ frankly calls it a bad riddle, because it is unsolvable — Samson is the only one who knew the solution! Moore evaluates v. 18 as an ironical statement about Samson's capitulation before his Timnathic bride. The two complements of the riddle would then have existed without any relation or inner logic⁽¹²⁾.

Many scholars are of the opinion that the answer to the riddle is *honey*. T. H. Gaster even suggests the following paraphrase to simplify this conclusion:

⁽⁹⁾ Cf., e.g., C. F. KEIL, *Das Buch der Richter* (Commentar über die prophetischen Geschichtsbücher des alten Testaments; Leipzig 1863) 314.

⁽¹⁰⁾ N. H. TUR SINAI (TORCZYNER), "The Riddle in the Bible", *HUCA* 1 (1924) 125-149.

⁽¹¹⁾ G. F. MOORE, *Judges* (ICC; Edinburgh 1918) 335. Cf. also A. SCHULZ, *Das Buch der Richter und das Buch Ruth* (Die Heilige Schrift des alten Testaments II/4-5; Bonn 1926) 79 and N. ZAPLETAI, *Das Buch der Richter* (EHAT 7/1; Münster 1923) 220-221.

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. also A. G. VAN DAALES, *Simson: Een onderzoek naar de plaats, de opbouw en de funksie van het Simsonverhaal in het kader van de Oudtestamentische Geschiedschrijving* (Assen 1966) 96.

"It comes from 'the eater'
 'tis something you eat,
 — from something fierce [i.e. bees, Nel]
 but itself is sweet⁽¹³⁾".

This exposition of the riddle obviously runs into trouble with v. 18: "What is stronger than a lion?" This problem is (quite ingeniously) overcome by postulating a Hebrew homophone 'ry with the meaning *honey*⁽¹⁴⁾. Apart from the problem concerning the justification of this etymological explanation, the connection of the adjective ry with *honey* is explained unconvincingly. One could also ask: For what purpose then is the prominent motif of the lion introduced in this chapter?

Another rationale for the above-mentioned conjecture is found in the attempt of H.-P. Müller to classify this riddle as belonging to the group of riddles operating structurally with a "Chiffrierung der Wirklichkeit" (codifying of reality):

die Verrätselung des gemeinten Gegenstandes geschieht dadurch, daß man ihn mit Chiffren benennt. Dabei sind in Jud. XIV, 14aα für das Gemeinte Chiffren mit gleichen Attributen, in v. 14aβ die adjektivischen Bezeichnungen dieser Attribute selbst eingesetzt⁽¹⁵⁾.

Thus, אכל (v. 14a) is a code-word ("Chiffre") for a lion as well as for "one who vomits" and the "bridegroom", because all of them could be qualified simultaneously as צר (strong) when concentrating on their "appetite"! מאכל, on the other hand, is a code-word for "honey" as well as for "vomit" and the "sperma virile", because מאכל (something to eat) can easily be associated with the adjective מתוק (sweet). The attributes אכל and מאכל are code-words for various phenomena, but the particular way in which their codification (Chiffrierung) is conceived lends paradigmatic status to all the phenomena codified by אכל or מאכל. In other words, this kind of codification (Chiffrierung) permits the categorization of objects or attributes which do not necessarily form an obvious paradigm.

⁽¹³⁾ T. H. GASTER, *Myth, Legend, and Custom in the Old Testament* (London 1969) 436.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. H. BAUR, "Zu Simsons Rätsel in Richter Kapitel 14", *ZDMG* 66 (1912) 473, J. R. PORTER, "'Samson', Riddle, Judges XIV, 14.18", *JThS* 13 (1962) 106-109 and N. ZAPLETAI, *Das Buch der Richter*, 223.

⁽¹⁵⁾ "Der Begriff 'Rätsel'", 467-468. Cf. also A. JOLLES, *Einfache Formen*, 140-146.

The answer to the first riddle (v. 14) is explained in a "gastro-nomical" way by H. Gressman⁽¹⁶⁾: The belching and vomiting resulting from the alcohol and unusual delicacies at the wedding party would be so strong and irrepressible that even the strongest man could not control them. The answer to the second riddle (v. 18) is *love*. He thus underscores the viewpoint of Gunkel⁽¹⁷⁾ that v. 18 constitutes a separate riddle. The only connection between the two riddles is the context of the wedding festival: "Beide Rätsel stimmen in ihrer Derbheit überein, gehören in dieselbe Situation und haben sich daher gegenseitig angezogen⁽¹⁸⁾".

The attempt has often been made to explain the narrative symbols in an astral way: the lion represents the lion-constellation. The visibility of this constellation and the sun's position regarding the constellation means mid-summer, which is, of course, the productive period for honey⁽¹⁹⁾. This explanation is a refined way of harmonizing the prominent phenomena, i.e. the *lion* and *honey*. The coalescence of these two entities in Samson's riddle has even occasioned attempts to couple it with an ancient belief about the origin of bees from a dead carcass, extensively described by Virgil⁽²⁰⁾.

The "erotic" explanation seems to be winning ground. The answer to v. 18 is correctly interpreted as a reference to *love*. H. Gunkel mainly concentrated on the contrasting adjectives "sweet" and "bitter" ("gierig") in v. 18 to substantiate his view. By comparison with similar metaphors in Cant 2,3 and 8,6 he concluded that only "love" can simultaneously be described with מתוק (sweet) and צר (bitter)⁽²¹⁾. If the answer is love (as the argument normally continues), the first independent riddle (v. 14) must also have love (sex) as its

⁽¹⁶⁾ *Die Anfänge Israels* (Die Schriften des Alten Testaments 1/2; Göttingen 1914) 250-251.

⁽¹⁷⁾ H. GUNKEL, "Simson", 52-54.

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Die Anfänge Israels*, 251.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. the discussions of E. BERTHEAU, *Das Buch der Richter und Ruth* (KEHAT; Leipzig 1883) 212-213 and P. CARUS, *The Story of Samson and its Place in the Religious Development of Mankind* (Chicago 1907) 90-92 and 113-132. Compare the inconsistencies of this view, as pointed out by O. EISSFELDT, "Die Rätsel in Jud 14", *ZAW* 30 (1910) 132 and H. GUNKEL, "Simson", 62-64.

⁽²⁰⁾ For a detailed exposition cf. C. F. BURNEY, *The Book of Judges with Introduction and Notes* (London 1918) 359-361.

⁽²¹⁾ H. GUNKEL, "Simson", 54-55.

content. The riddle would then metaphorically refer to male potency, on which Hertzberg comments: "... der Orient ist an diesem Punkte keineswegs schamhaft⁽²²⁾". The deductions are as follows: *האכל* signifies the lion (i.e. the bridegroom); *מאכל* signifies the honey (i.e. the male sperm), whereas *עץ* and *מתוק* indicate the quality of love⁽²³⁾. The riddle is understood in a similar way by Eissfeldt; he, however, maintains that vv. 14 and 18 are two independent riddles. The answer to the first riddle would have been so vulgar that it was omitted altogether by later traditions⁽²⁴⁾.

Against Eissfeldt, *et al.*, it must be strongly emphasized that the riddle of Samson does not consist of two separate riddles. The textual context exhibits only *one* riddle. The validity of the solution of the riddle, as given by the groomsmen (v. 18), has never been questioned. Samson also accepted it, even though he blamed the men for ploughing with his calf (v. 18).

The sceptical view that Samson's riddle is unreasonable, because he is the only one who could have known the answer, most probably results from a procedure which considers textual history (the sequence of events in narrative texts) as factual history. Such an assumption also implies that the riddle is primarily oriented towards a man-world experience. Most riddles, however, lack such traces⁽²⁵⁾, at least those of a more creative and artistic nature. The folkloristic riddles may relate to objects and events of real experience for the one who composes the riddle. He is then also the only one who knows the answer to the riddle. Gunkel has correctly stressed the resemblances between this kind of riddle and the narrative-riddle of certain "Märchen"⁽²⁶⁾.

⁽²²⁾ H. W. HERTZBERG, *Die Bücher Josua, Richter, Ruth* (ATD; Göttingen 1953) 229.

⁽²³⁾ Cf. J. L. CRENSHAW, "Wisdom", *Old Testament Form Criticism* (ed. J. H. HAYES) (San Antonio 1977) 243.

⁽²⁴⁾ O. EISSFELDT, "Die Rätsel", 134. His own interpretation runs as follows: "Der männliche Same — das scheint mir ursprünglich die Antwort auf das Rätsel zu sein. Vom Manne, dem essenden, geht der Same aus, der das Weib gleichsam speist; und vom Manne, dem starken, grausamen, bitteren geht der Same aus, der dem Weib süß, d.i. angenehm ist". "Eat" and "drink" are therefore metaphorically employed as a means to describe sexual intercourse.

⁽²⁵⁾ Cf. A. JOLLES, *Einfache Formen*, 129 and L. RÖHRICH, *RGG* 5, 767.

⁽²⁶⁾ "Simson", 53.

The known riddles of the Bible are not restricted to personal or historical experience for their composition. This view rejects the opinion that historical experience is the most prominently constitutive feature of the riddle. It does not exclude, however, any form of a man-world orientation. Therefore, it is not justified to characterize Samson's riddle as a capricious game, inspired by casual incidents of experience, and with an arbitrary codification⁽²⁷⁾.

The establishment of riddles indicates a definite abstraction from historical experience in order to rejoin objects and events within specific schemes of classification. The reshuffling and rearrangement of phenomena are facilitated by their inherent analogies and corresponding attributes. The enigma as final result exhibits the new and unusual systematization. The categorization does not necessarily follow the lines of logical systematization, but also implies illogical opposition and paradox. The function and inherent coherence of objects, events and attributes in a particular riddle are mainly the result of cognitive activity. In its structure and application the riddle is primarily an intellectual game that deals with the ability to recognize and scrutinize the coherence, symmetry, opposition and paradox of phenomena. The unravelling of the riddle's strategy is always a creative exercise, because the riddle directs and misleads(!) by its inherent parallelism and paradox. I can, therefore, underscore Jolles' emphasis on the importance of the manner in which the riddle is unravelled (das Lösen). The answer (die Lösung) itself is not the main concern. The prominent feature is "daß der Gefragte imstande ist, sie zu geben, es kommt ihm darauf an, den Gefragten zu veranlassen, sie ihm zu geben⁽²⁸⁾". The perspicacity and wisdom of the one who guesses is put to the test. It obviously implies that at least the minimum of indicative keys to its solution must be inherent in the formulation of the riddle itself.

The riddle of Samson is indeed an ingeniously and subtly constructed achievement; no wonder Samson could assume such a self-

(27) H. SIMIAN-YOFRE, "Ez 17,1-10 como enigma y parábola", *Bib* 65 (1984) 41. — His treatment of *hîdâ* and *māšāl* in Ps 49 and 78 in comparison with Ezek 17, 1-10 to elucidate the "parable" content of *hîdâ* is convincing, cf. p. 41-43. However, he does not explain the character of the riddle in Judg 14, which, in our opinion, falls into a category of its own.

(28) *Einfache Formen*, 134-135.

confident posture. It was, however, neither totally unsolvable nor unreasonable.

The riddle (v. 14) is cast in the form of two indicative statements, forming a perfect 3+3 rhythmic parallelism. The first complement is paradoxically formulated, as is evident from the use of the same word stem, אכל: Out of the *eater* came *something to eat*. An eater consumes and does not produce food. The repetition of the verb יצא, as well as the same rhyme pattern in the second stich already signify a certain parallelism. Antithetic as well as synthetic parallelisms are eliminated, because of the repetition of the same verb and the evidence of an isotope-analysis (i.e., an analysis of semantic key-words). The only possibility left is that one accepts a synonymous parallelism. Since it is a synonymous parallelism, one would expect the same kind of paradox in the second stich as is found in the first. But here it is not the case. This is in fact the first clue to the strategy of this riddle: The synonymity is not expressed as a degree of identity, but the two adjectives (עז and מתוק) correspond in ascending order of importance to the two objects of the first stich. The expected paradox between the attributes does not hold true to the same extent. Gunkel⁽²⁹⁾, et al., have translated עז with "gierig" and "bitter" in order to maintain the same kind of paradox in the second stich. Such a meaning of עז has not yet been attested beyond doubt. Even if one would accept Gunkel's proposal, it does not diminish the climactic sequence between the two complements of v. 14. This feature can be explained as intentional strategy to emphasize the descriptive signifiers. The solving of the riddle will obviously then focus on these two key-words, עז and מתוק. The main concern is therefore the description of the *eater* as *strong* and the *food* as *sweet*, and not the continuation of the paradox (i.e., the misleading aspect!) of the first stich.

As is to be expected, these two attributes occur in the central positions (following the interrogative particles) of the answer (v. 18). The solution is again formulated in a perfect 2 + 2 poetic parallelism — but this time it only forms a structural synonymous parallelism. The only explicit resemblance between the statements is the fact that both operate with a kind of superlative comparison in question form:

(29) Cf. H. GUNKEL, "Simson", 54-55.

*as sweet as honey and
as strong as a lion.*

Let us refocus on the two key-words in their prominent positions. A competent riddle-solver, when recognizing these two prominent concepts *עז* and *מתוק*, must have been in a position to scan through the paradigms of possibly correct equivalents to them. The choice must also be guided by a conceptual symmetry or paradox of the eventual configuration.

For our understanding it still seems an impossible undertaking. But the "circumstantial evidence" facilitates the task. It must be kept in mind that honey is the sweetness (*מתוק*) par excellence, and similarly the lion is associated with strength (*עז*). The wedding is a further important contextual hint, and at a wedding ceremony *love* enjoys a certain priority. We must further reckon with the possibility that the solution (v. 18), although in question form, existed as a popular proverb. It is possible that this saying was originally a folkloristic riddle. It is, however, conceivable that popular and well-known riddles gained for themselves the status of proverbs through a certain length of time. The so-called numerical saying, popular in the Wisdom tradition (cf., e.g., Prov 30,15-31), is probably reminiscent of such crystallized riddles⁽³⁰⁾. Given the status of a popular proverb⁽³¹⁾ its truth or meaning is expressed in the formulation itself — an additional explicit answer would be superfluous. The content of this proverb is clearly *love*⁽³²⁾. The two comparisons, as formulated in the parallelism ("sweeter than honey and stronger than a lion"), obviously converge in their conceptual reference (i.e., *love*). This saying is not paradoxically formulated as suggested by J.-P. Müller⁽³³⁾. The intention of the saying is constituted in the extraordinary comparison of specific qualities. The comparison shows that

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf. N. H. TORCZYNER, "The Riddle in the Bible", 135-136.

⁽³¹⁾ We can assume that gnomic sentences could also have been formulated in an interrogative form, cf. e.g. Prov 6,27.28; 14,22; 17,16; 26,12; 23,29; 29,20; 30,4; Qoh 3,21; 4,11.

⁽³²⁾ This is correctly recognized by most commentators, except those who assume that the answer is *honey*. The status of v. 18 is, however, not that of an independent riddle as is often stressed in accordance with the views of H. GUNKEL, "Simson", 38-64 and O. EISSFELDT, "Die Rätsel", 34-35.

⁽³³⁾ "Der Begriff 'Rätsel'", 448-489.

only one reality is presupposed; one reality of enormous "strength" and simultaneously of incomparable "sweetness": that is, love. So the skillfully constructed riddle of Samson displays the two key-words, sweet and strong, for its unravelling. The expected answer is the popular proverb (v. 18) in which these two key-words play a central role. V. 18 as such is therefore the solution of the riddle.

The analysis above shows that the understanding of Samson's riddle is primarily a question of our interpretation of the creative process underlying the riddle. I have tried to explain that the major clue for solving the problem is given in the popular proverb of v. 18a: "What is sweeter than honey and stronger than a lion? Although there is no *expressis verbis* proof in the Old Testament that the answer to this saying is "love", the contextual indications make such a deduction plausible. The lack of an explicit answer is further proof of the fact that v. 18a had already gained the status of a popular proverb.

In order to arrive at the correct answer (v. 18a), the corpus of the riddle (v. 14) is skillfully constructed so as to highlight the key-words and simultaneously to signify a particular reality that is both "strong" and "sweet". This is the main strategy of Samson's riddle. The poetically constructed v. 14 does employ a particular "Chiffrierung der Wirklichkeit", as H.-P. Müller⁽³⁴⁾ puts it, without which the answer would be too obvious. However one must be careful not to overestimate the "Chiffrierung" as an excuse to force unjustifiable meanings into particular lexemes. We have no explicit indications that v. 14a as such has love as its content. V. 14a, however, is pointing semantically to a specific reality and is structurally composed in such a way as to indicate and anticipate the popular proverb of v. 18. V. 18 has "love" as its content.

The components of the riddle are also strategically integrated by the narrator with the immediate context; or should we rather say that the immediate narrative context is oriented towards the essential components of the riddle? The prominent phenomena of the riddle (i.e. the "lion" and "honey" or "bees") also receive due attention from the narrator so as to let them coincide within the personal ("historical") experience of his main character, Samson. The events surrounding Samson's encounter with the lion and the bees

(34) "Der Begriff 'Rätsel'", 467-468.

are so conflicting that the only reasonable deduction seems to be that the narrator has attempted to introduce the basic motifs of the riddle into a narrative prelude. His aim is to narrate a particular "story" and not to tell riddles. Therefore he must harmonize the riddle with the sequence of his narrative history⁽³⁵⁾. The structure of the "history" and that of the riddle then became so intertwined that it looks as though the historical events occasioned the development of the riddle.

The assumption given above has an important implication: V. 14 has, apart from its function to direct the attempts for its' own solution no other referential context than the narrative history (especially vv. 5-9) created by the narrator. A kind of counterbalance is thus achieved between what actually happened (the way in which the riddle was composed) and what the narrator intended (the progression of his narrative history).

In conclusion: the elements of the entire riddle are skillfully integrated into the narrative history of Chapter 14; it is even probable that the narrative progression of Chapter 14 is constructed according to the structural features of the riddle. The riddle is the focal point of Chapter 14 and its consequence is the beginning of Samson's punitive acts⁽³⁶⁾ against the Philistines, the objective of Samson's mission; cf. Chapter 13.

The narrator of the Samson story ironically utilized the truth of Samson's riddle (i.e. the irresistibility of love) in his motif-centered history of Samson. The wisdom of the riddle is materialized within the context of the riddle itself, because Samson was unable to resist the love of his new bride before the wedding night, even if it might have cost him the contest. Ironically this wisdom was also displayed in his illicit affairs with the prostitute of Gaza (16,1-3) and with Delilah (16,4-22). It is Samson the Nazirite, consecrated to Yahweh, who actualized the wisdom of the riddle in the Philistine arena! This motif is employed by the narrator as a means of structural progression in the story. The consequences of Samson's amor-

(35) "Narrative history" is employed here as a theoretical concept to denote the sequence of events in narrative texts.

(36) H. GUNKEL, "Simson", 47, was the first to demonstrate that Samson's punitive acts are deliberately depicted against the background of the principle of *lex talionis* in order to justify his behaviour. This chain of reactions was triggered by the consequences of the riddle.

ous desires are the beginning of the conflict between the Philistines and Samson (actually Yahweh!).

The riddle of Samson, therefore, has a functional position at the beginning of the real plot, i.e. the conflict between the Philistines and Yahweh. Its inherent wisdom is also exploited as a means of narrative coherence and narrative progression⁽³⁷⁾.

Dept. of Semitic Languages
University of the Orange Free State
9301 Bloemfontein
Rep. of South Africa

Philip NEL

SOMMAIRE

L'énigme de Samson (Jg 14,14.18) n'était ni insoluble ni déraisonnable. Le v. 18 en donne la solution explicite. L'énigme est construite poétiquement de telle sorte qu'elle souligne les deux mots-clés (עַז et מְתוּק) pour sa propre solution. Ces deux mots-clés sont les concepts constitutifs du proverbe populaire: «Qu'est-il de plus doux que du miel et de plus fort qu'un lion?» (v. 18). La signification référentielle de ce proverbe est *l'amour*. Le proverbe populaire cité par les convives était par conséquent la réponse attendue.

L'énigme de Samson constitue le point central du chapitre 14. La sagesse exprimée dans l'énigme est utilisée comme moyen structural à travers l'histoire de Samson.

⁽³⁷⁾ For the research I received partial financial support from the Human Sciences Research Council.

ANIMADVERSIONES

Luke and Paul on Impartiality

The discrepancies between Acts and the Pauline corpus are quite notorious in matters of theology as well as history; so notorious, in fact, that it is questionable whether the author of Acts was actually familiar with the apostle's letters⁽¹⁾. Thus one can legitimately express surprise over the apparently mundane fact that both Acts 10 and Romans (yet *only* Acts 10 and Romans) suggest the same theological justification for the Gentile mission: divine impartiality⁽²⁾. To be sure, in Acts the initiation of the Gentile mission and the insight into the universalistic implications of impartiality are attributed to Peter, not to Paul. Nevertheless, there is a close correlation between the wording and application of the statements of impartiality in Acts and in Romans⁽³⁾. It is, however, the argument of this paper that the author of Acts (henceforth, for convenience, "Luke") and Paul are not really saying the same thing when they appeal to divine impartiality. Behind the verbal similarities lie quite different understandings of impartiality, one of which is rooted in Jewish notions of divine judgment, the other of which seems closer to Greco-Roman expressions of universality.

I. Paul and Impartiality

Paul's statement of divine impartiality (Rom 2,11) draws on the judicial overtones that dominated Israel's understanding of the theologoumenon⁽⁴⁾. In

⁽¹⁾ E. HAENCHEN (*The Acts of the Apostles: A Commentary* [Philadelphia 1971] 125) asserts that "no proof can be offered" to confirm Luke's knowledge of the Pauline epistles. G. BORNKAMM is even less ambiguous when he affirms (*Paul* [New York 1971] xx) that "not a single passage in Luke's whole book shows either knowledge of the apostle's own letters or use made of them".

⁽²⁾ HAENCHEN thus overstates the case somewhat when he claims that although Luke and Paul both focus on the problem of the law-free mission to the Gentiles, Luke "is *unaware of Paul's solution*" (*Acts*, 112, emphasis his). Certainly Luke does not provide the sustained theological discussion of the problem that Paul does in Romans, but the evangelist does adduce the same theological warrant (impartiality) that the apostle provides, though he may indeed have been unaware that it was Paul's solution. Likewise, S. G. WILSON's comment (*The Gentiles and the Gentile Mission in Luke-Acts* [SNTSMS 23; Cambridge 1973] 251) that Luke, unlike Paul, has no theology of the Gentiles overlooks the fact that both cite the same theological concept in support of the Gentile mission.

⁽³⁾ Paul writes, "οὐ γὰρ ἐστὶν προσωπολήμψία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ" (Rom 2,11), while the words, "οὐκ ἐστὶν προσωπολήμψις ὁ θεός", are found in Acts 10,34. Though neither is a direct quotation, both reflect the translation Greek of the Septuagint, where the Hebrew idiom for partiality (to lift up the face) was rendered rather woodenly, if not literally, as λαμβάνειν or θαυμάζειν πρόσωπον.

⁽⁴⁾ I have presented the Pauline side of this argument more fully in *Divine Impartiality: Paul and a Theological Axiom* (Chico 1982).

the Hebrew Bible, God is presented as the Supreme Judge, to whom is ascribed the best traits of human judges. Just and impartial, God rewards the righteous, punishes the guilty, and accepts no bribe⁽⁵⁾. This basic statement was often cited to emphasize specifically the equal treatment of rich and poor, small and great within Israel's society⁽⁶⁾. In later writings, however, the notion of the fundamental equity of small and great before the divine tribunal became a vehicle for more universalistic insights. Gentiles, the powerful and wealthy oppressors of Israel, would not escape God's retributive justice⁽⁷⁾, and even Israel, God's own people, could not expect to escape just punishment from the God who does not favor *any* group over another⁽⁸⁾.

Paul's statement of divine impartiality in Rom 2,11 is clearly rooted in these juridical concepts. In words that explicitly recall the biblical theologoumenon, Paul announces God's righteous justice in which all will be judged according to an impartial standard of merit:

For he will render to every one according to his works... There will be tribulation and distress for every human being who does evil, the Jew first and also the Greek, but glory and honor and peace for every one who does good, the Jew first and also the Greek. For God shows no partiality⁽⁹⁾.

Here Paul does not allude to the traditional categories of rich and poor or great and small, but passes directly to the claim of equal treatment for Jew and Greek, that is, universal impartiality that allows no distinction because of ethnic origin. In framing impartiality in this way, Paul goes beyond his Jewish contemporaries only in explicitly claiming it as the theological basis not merely for equity in eschatological punishment, but also for equity in eschatological rewards⁽¹⁰⁾. This apparently modest step, however, presages the actual goal of the opening argument in Romans, which is to proclaim that the ultimate eschatological reward, justification, is not only available now, but is available now to both Jews and Gentiles alike:

But now the righteousness of God has been manifested apart from law... the righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ for all who believe. For there is no distinction; since all have sinned and

⁽⁵⁾ 2 Chr 19,7; compare the description of Israel's human judges in Deut 16,19.

⁽⁶⁾ Job 34,19 and Deut 10,17-18; note the similar emphasis in the admonitions to human judges in Deut 1,17 and Lev 19,15.

⁽⁷⁾ This emphasis is implied in Sir 35,12-19 and is quite explicit in the passages from Wis 6,7, Jub 5,12-16, 2 Bar 13,8-10, 1 Enoch 63,6-9, and Ps Sol 2,15-35.

⁽⁸⁾ This message is especially strong in *Psalms of Solomon* 2, 2 Baruch 13, and in chap. 20 of the *Biblical Antiquities* of Pseudo-Philo.

⁽⁹⁾ Rom 2,6,9-11.

⁽¹⁰⁾ Although a reference to God's impartial allocation of the primordial blessings of creation on Jews and Gentiles alike is found, e.g., in 2 Bar 13,8-12, it is only in later rabbinic material that impartiality is explicitly interpreted to mean eschatological blessings for all people. See *Midr. Tadshe*, 20 and especially *Tanna debe Eliahu*, *Eliahu zuta* 7 (p. 184 of the Friedmann edition), *Eliahu rabba* (9) 10 (p. 48), and *Eliahu rabba* (5) 6 (p. 36).

fall short of the glory of God, they are justified by his grace as a gift, through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus⁽¹¹⁾.

In this passage, the translation Greek of 2,11 (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν προσωποληψία) has been replaced by standard koine Greek in 3,22 (οὐ γάρ ἐστιν διαστολή), but the allusion to impartiality is retained. Just as there is no distinction in the divine judgment, where Jew and Gentile fare alike, so too there is no distinction in God's grace, which is available to all. Later Paul repeats this important point and emphasizes its universalistic implications:

The scripture says, "No one who believes in him will be put to shame". For there is no distinction between Jew and Greek; the same Lord is Lord of all and bestows his riches upon all who call upon him. For, "every one who calls upon the name of the Lord will be saved"⁽¹²⁾.

For Paul, then, the traditional juristic concept of divine impartiality is important not simply for its own sake, but for its implications for the new message of grace. Indeed, impartiality provides an important thread of continuity between the old dispensation and the new. The dispensation of grace has replaced the dispensation of the law, but God's impartiality remains invariant. Just as impartiality did not allow God to distinguish between Jew and Gentile in judgment (Rom 2,9-11), now it does not allow a distinction in grace (3,22-24). Although impartiality is maintained in both dispensations, a significant shift occurs in the way it is maintained. An impartial treatment of Jews and Gentiles was achieved under the old dispensation by a rigorous application of the principle of merit (Rom 1,18-2,29). Under the new dispensation, however, this impartial treatment is achieved by replacing the principle of merit (works) with the principle of faith. The righteousness required by God is now a gift available to all who believe, apart from merit and without distinction (3,21-31). Thus "no distinction" between Jew and Greek remains constant, yet this is achieved on the one hand by a concern for merit so rigorous that it can ignore ethnic boundaries, and on the other hand by an emphasis on grace which, because it is bestowed *apart* from merit, can also ignore these boundaries.

II. Acts and Impartiality

There are, as we have noted, some striking similarities between Paul's statement of the concept of impartiality in Romans and the statement we find in Acts 10. The wording, for example, is very similar. Both draw on the translation Greek of the Septuagint to give the initial statement of the concept in terms of προσωποληψία (Rom 2,11; Acts 10,34), and both revert to standard Greek terms for the subsequent discussion. Paul, for example, uses the noun διαστολή in Romans 3 and 10 to develop further the idea of no distinction (impartiality) while Luke shifts to the verb διακρίνειν in Acts 15,9 for the same purpose. Moreover, the application of the concept is the

⁽¹¹⁾ Rom 3,21-24.

⁽¹²⁾ Rom 10,11-13.

same in both Acts and Romans: it is used to justify the Gentile mission of the early church. Nevertheless there is a difference between the two that is far more substantive than the shift from Paul to Peter as the recipient of the insight into divine impartiality. It is a difference in the understanding of the concept itself. Let us look at the way Luke develops the theologumenon of impartiality.

Chapter ten describes the conversion of Cornelius, who was, according to Acts, the first Gentile convert to Christianity⁽¹³⁾. Though a Gentile, Cornelius had made great strides in piety prior to his conversion, and his exemplary life is repeatedly stressed. At the outset of the story, for example, Luke describes Cornelius as "a devout man who feared God with all his household, gave alms liberally to the people, and prayed constantly to God" (v. 2). Prompted by a vision, which was itself a reward for his piety (vv. 3-4), Cornelius sent for Peter, delegating some servants and a devout soldier for this mission. When this delegation delivered their message to the apostle, they described their master in glowing terms as "an upright and God-fearing man, who is well spoken of by the whole Jewish nation" (v. 22). Peter, also prepared by a vision for these events, agreed to visit Cornelius. After hearing the centurion's story, Peter recognized the presence of God's guiding hand and exclaimed, "Truly I perceive that God shows no partiality, but in every nation any one who fears him and does what is right is acceptable to him" (vv. 34-35).

To some extent, Kiddle's assessment of this story is correct: "Cornelius is credited with every possible qualification which, short of circumcision, would satisfy the Jews"⁽¹⁴⁾. That is, Cornelius is presented, in all aspects save one, as the Christian analogue of a Jewish proselyte. But as far as I have been able to determine, no contemporary Jewish sources use the theologumenon of impartiality to defend or define proselyte conversion. Thus whereas Paul's contribution in this area was to appropriate the concept of divine impartiality for his defense of the new dispensation of grace, Luke's unique contribution seems to be to apply the concept to his Christian version of proselyte conversion, the inclusion of worthy Gentiles in the new people of God. Yet these two applications reflect dramatically different understandings of the implications of impartiality. To appreciate this difference, we need to survey briefly some aspects of Greco-Roman universalism.

⁽¹³⁾ The story of the conversion of the Ethiopian eunuch (Acts 8,26-40) could be adduced to challenge the priority and thus the importance of the Cornelius episode, as is done, e.g., by E. RICHARD ("The Divine Purpose: The Jews and the Gentile Mission (Acts 15)", *Luke-Acts: New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature Seminar* [ed. C. H. Talbert; New York 1984] 200). Yet whatever the original significance of the story of the eunuch, it is clear that Luke regards Cornelius, and not the Ethiopian, as the first Gentile convert and has elaborated the Cornelius tradition to emphasize the immense significance of the event; see WILSON, *Gentile Mission*, 171-195; J. DUPONT, "Le salut des gentils et la signification théologique du livre des Actes", *NTS* 6 (1959-60) 146-149; and M. DIBELIUS, *Studies in the Acts of the Apostles* (New York 1956) 109-122.

⁽¹⁴⁾ M. KIDDLE, "The Admission of the Gentiles in St. Luke's Gospel and Acts", *JTS* 36 (1935) 171.

Though the distinction between Greeks and barbarians was viewed as natural by the early Greeks and later emphasized by Plato and Aristotle, statements about the basic equality of all men began to appear in the writings of the fifth-century Sophists⁽¹⁵⁾. It was, however, the Stoics who gave to this language of universalism the strongest theoretical grounding. By distinguishing all human beings from all other animate beings through their common possession of reason, the Stoics were able to achieve insights into the inherent unity of the human race. Yet this was only a *potential* unity, for the Stoics had a further conviction that not all made equal use of their common and natural inheritance. Thus although the old Greek-barbarian dichotomy fell before this anthropological insight, a new division was simultaneously erected. This new division, though cutting across ethnic lines, firmly distinguished between the wise, those few (of any race or nationality) who made full use of their natural reason to achieve perfection, and the foolish, the much larger number who fell short of this idealized goal.

Somewhat later the Middle Stoa expanded the category of the wise by defining it in terms of effort and not perfection. Those in an intermediate state of progress (προκοπή) toward perfection were included with the few who had actually achieved this state. The following words from Cicero's treatise *De Officiis* suggest how broadly the new category could be defined:

Now, the men we live with are not perfect and ideally wise, but men who do very well, if there is found in them but the semblance of virtue. I therefore think that this is to be taken for granted, that no one should be entirely neglected who shows any trace of virtue; but the more a man is endowed with these finer virtues – temperance, self-control and justice – the more he deserves to be favored⁽¹⁶⁾.

Thus a measure of universalism was achieved by recognizing all humans, Greeks or barbarians, to be in possession of reason and capable of wisdom, though those who made proper use of this reason (the wise, broadly defined) were clearly distinguished from those who did not. This distinction is particularly clear in Aristides' fawning encomium of Rome, though he provides an odd twist to the universalism theme by identifying the wise everywhere as Roman citizens. Thus when he contrasts citizen with non-citizen in the following text, he is actually commenting on the gulf that separates the wise from the foolish:

You (the Roman empire) have divided all the people of the empire – when I say that, I mean the whole world – in two classes; and all the more cultured, virtuous, and able ones everywhere you have made into citizens and even nationals of Rome; the rest into vassals and subjects. . . . Neither the sea nor any distance on land shuts a man out from citizenship. Asia and Europe are in this respect not separate. Everything lies open to everybody, and no one fit for office or respon-

⁽¹⁵⁾ A number of contemporary works have addressed the topic of the origin and nature of Greek universalism. For a good introduction to this scholarship, see H. C. BALDRY, *The Unity of Mankind in Greek Thought* (Cambridge 1965).

⁽¹⁶⁾ *De Officiis* i. 15. 46, trans. by W. Miller, LCL.

sibility is an alien... . You have stopped classifying nationalities as Greek or barbarian... . You have redivided mankind into Romans and non-Romans⁽¹⁷⁾.

The statement of divine impartiality in Acts 10 seems rooted in this sort of concept. Far from reflecting Paul's understanding of the justification of the ungodly (Rom 4,5), it is clear that Cornelius is being carefully presented as one who has made considerable progress toward an ideal of virtue. When Luke stresses Cornelius's divine vision, Peter's even more elaborate one, and the outpouring of the Holy Spirit, he is announcing that the conversion of Cornelius was part of God's will and plan, which is thus revealed as one that includes acceptance of both Jews and Gentiles. Yet Luke is not only concerned with what God has done, he is also interested in what Cornelius has done, for it is not just any Gentile who is the first and representative member of his group to convert to Christianity. Rather, it is one who through upright and devout behavior has already conformed to the ideal standard of behavior of Jewish-Christianity. Thus although Peter's words stress the theological rather than the anthropological side of these events, the context suggests that the operative concept here is closer to the pattern of Greco-Roman universalism than to the juridical, theological presuppositions of Paul. Impartiality that celebrates the nature of the God who offers grace to all apart from merit has thus become an impartiality that acknowledges the ability of Gentiles to conform to Jewish-Christian standards of merit.

III. Conclusion

Paul argues apocalyptically and dialectically. In the old dispensation Jews and Greeks were all judged by the same rigorous standard of merit; in the new dispensation divine grace is universally available to Jews and Greeks apart from merit; in both, however, divine impartiality is manifest. Here in Acts' equivalent of Paul's new dispensation, the eschatological notion of justification is replaced by the tamed and historicized notion of acceptability, and merit is very much in evidence. Indeed, this stress on merit recalls Paul's view of impartiality in the *old* dispensation (Rom 2,10), yet the formulation is not Paul's. The apostle's juridical overtones are missing, replaced by something more akin to acceptance into a club that is both exclusive (on the basis of praxis) and universal (on the basis of nationality). Instead of an argument that stresses through balanced clauses the equal justice, whether reward or punishment, that both Jew and Greek receive at the divine tribunal (Rom 2,9-12), Acts 10 places the emphasis on the movement of a representative member of one group toward the acknowledged ideal of behavior of another group. Though this ideal is expressed in terms of Jewish piety, the concept is very close to Greco-Roman expressions of universalism,

⁽¹⁷⁾ Εἰς Ῥώμην, 59-63; trans. by J. H. OLIVER in "The Ruling Power; A Study of the Roman Empire in the Second Century after Christ through the Roman Oration of Aelius Aristides", *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 43 (1953) 871-1003.

which speak of a universal ability to attain membership in the elite group of the wise and where non-attainment is the negative side of this concept, not punishment. Thus the statements by Cicero and Aristides seem to have more in common with Acts 10 than Paul's discussion of judicial impartiality.

Paul's understanding of divine impartiality is ultimately more radical than Luke's. He uses the concept as part of his defense of the end of the law and the inauguration of a new dispensation of grace. Thus he appropriates a Jewish theologoumenon to announce the transformation, indeed, the termination, of Jewish religion. Luke, on the other hand, applies the familiar Jewish theologoumenon to a familiar Jewish practice, proselyte conversion. In the process, however, he creates an interpretation of the Gentile mission comprehensible to Jews and Gentiles alike, for out of this new combination there emerges a concept couched in Jewish terms yet akin to familiar Greco-Roman notions of universality. Paul thus interprets impartiality as the elimination of all categories, while Luke interprets it as the opening of one category to worthy members of another. The concept of impartiality is thus a concrete example of Bornkamm's general assessment of the relationship between Paul and Acts: when two people say the same thing, it ceases to be the same thing⁽¹⁸⁾.

Department of Theology
Georgetown University
Washington, D. C., U.S.A.

Jouette M. BASSLER

⁽¹⁸⁾ *Paul*, xvi.

Luke 2,41-50: Foreshadowing of Jesus, Teacher

Premise

Though the story of Luke 2,41-50 (The Finding of Jesus in the Temple) is awkwardly placed under the title "the Infancy Narratives"⁽¹⁾, it is, like the other elements of the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel, a story of introduction to the life of the adult Jesus, a story of foreshadowing⁽²⁾. Thus, as with the previous stories, so here, one can expect to see played out in the central part of the Gospel the theme ideas of the Finding in the Temple. The relationship between Luke 2,41-50 and the later Gospel, therefore, plays a major role in the interpretation of this "Infancy" story.

Key Verses of the Story

It has been the hallmark of recent exegesis to deal sensitively with two essential elements of Luke's story. First, there is the consistent struggle to appraise the significance of Luke's statement regarding the acumen of Jesus before the teachers of Israel (vv. 46-47)⁽³⁾. This Lucan statement becomes

⁽¹⁾ J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (The Anchor Bible 28; New York 1981) 434-435; J. ERNST, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (RNT; Regensburg 1977) 122; I. H. MARSHALL, *Commentary on Luke* (New International Greek Commentary 3; Grand Rapids, Michigan 1978) 125.

⁽²⁾ R. E. BROWN, *The Birth of the Messiah* (New York 1977): "a preparation for his ministry" (482). FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, notes that, though the episode of Luke 2,42-50 is part of the Infancy Narratives, it is "on the whole transitional" between the infancy stories and Jesus's public ministry (435).

⁽³⁾ Cf. R. BULTMANN, *History of the Synoptic Tradition* (Oxford 1968) 300, wherein Bultmann stresses the wisdom-of-Jesus motif, based on v. 47 and on parallels with many other striking stories regarding the childhood of famous figures. FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, characterizes Bultmann's stress on wisdom motif as "overemphasis" (437); BROWN, *Messiah*, sees Luke emphasizing Jesus's "wisdom and life-work... although the wisdom is less important" (482). MARSHALL, *Luke*, acknowledges the story's illustration of Jesus's wisdom (125), but does not see its influence on later verses. Some other attempts to assess the importance of Luke's calling attention to Jesus's "wisdom": G. L. HAHN, *Das Evangelium des Lukas*, Vol. 1 (Breslau 1892) 225-226, 231; W. GRUNDMANN, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (THzNT 3; Berlin 1961): "die Erzählung erweist seine Weisheit und verbindet in einer bedeutsamen Weise Sohnschaft und Weisheit" (94), "... Sohnschaft... ist Grund und Inhalt seiner Weisheit" (96); H. SCHÜRMAN, *Das Lukasevangelium* (HTKzNT 3; Freiburg 1969): "Die folgende Abschlusserzählung hat zwei Höhepunkte... Der eigentliche Höhepunkt aber ist die Offenbarung des

all the more meaningful if, as some say, v. 47 is a sentence composed by Luke and inserted by him to develop the point made in v. 46⁽⁴⁾. Secondly, exegetes are clear in their agreement that great weight is to be placed on the question of Jesus to his parents, "Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?" (v. 49)⁽⁵⁾. It seems that these verses, together with v. 49, carry the brunt of what major meaning there is in this Lucan story; it seems right to see if they are harmoniously related, and I suggest here an integrated understanding of them which I have not found elsewhere. Through this harmony will the story's look to the future have its value.

Consideration of vv. 46-47

What are the significant points of verses 46-47? It seems to me, first, that Luke is calling the reader's attention to an ability of Jesus which, though it does not surpass the limits of human possibility in a twelve-year-old, can be said to "astound" all, even the teachers of the Temple⁽⁶⁾. Moreover, though intelligence and answers and questions are not more concretely described, it seems reasonable to assume that they centered on a discussion of the Law of Israel, i.e., the way in which Israel understood the commands of God⁽⁷⁾. Indeed, when one looks to the circumstances in which the title *didaskalos* is found in the rest of the Gospel, one finds that it is usually used in reference to interpretation of the Mosaic Law and the traditions derived from it⁽⁸⁾. Jesus, then, shows an unusual adeptness in understanding, questioning and answering the spiritual heritage that is the Law given to Israel. As a foreshadowing by a twelve-year-old, Jesus's future ability to be the teacher of God's will for mankind is solidly introduced. One should pause for a moment to consider the importance for Luke of the image of Jesus as

Sohnesgehorsams Jesu" (132-133) (as in FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 436); W. SCHMITTALS, *Das Evangelium nach Lukas* (Zürcher Bibelkommentar NT 3.1; Zürich 1980): "In vv. 48-50, die... den Höhepunkt der Erzählung bringt, werden die v. 41-47 ersten zusammengeführt" (47); E. E. ELLIS, *The Gospel of Luke* (The Century Bible; London 1981): "[The story's] significance lies in its witness to the developing wisdom and messianic consciousness of Christ" (84).

(4) The basic arguments in favor of v. 47 as a Lucan composition inserted into an earlier story are found in B. M. F. VAN IERSEL, "The Finding of Jesus in the Temple", *NT* 4 (1960) 169-173; FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, appears to accept this view (436). BROWN, *Messiah*, is non-committal: "...even if Van Iersel is right..." (489). MARSHALL, *Luke*, reacts similarly; after citing van Iersel's position, he notes "whether or not these verses are secondary..." (126). SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, says of van Iersel's argument: "er vermutet luk Einfügung, wo man nur auf redaktionelle Überarbeitung schliessen darf" (134, note 261). Cf. ERNST, *Lukas*, 122-123.

(5) Cf. BROWN, *Messiah*, 481; FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 437; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 126.

(6) I strongly agree with VAN IERSEL, "The Finding of Jesus", that Luke is in v. 47 consciously accentuating the possible implications of v. 46.

(7) Cf. SCHÜRMANN, *Lukasevangelium*, 135.

(8) Luke 7,40; 10,25; 11,45; 12,13; 19,39; 20,39.

teacher, in order to comprehend Luke's eagerness to provide the reader with an introduction to Jesus under this image.

Jesus as Teacher in Luke's work

It is commonly said that Luke used Mark's Gospel as one of his sources. If this be so, it is very striking how Luke has changed the initial image of Jesus as he began his ministry. Mark clearly had shown Jesus to be preacher of repentance (Mark 1,15: "repent..."), whereas at this significant point Luke speaks, not of a Jesus who calls for repentance, but of a Jesus who teaches (Luke 3,23: "When he began to teach..."; 4,15: "He taught in their synagogues..."). It seems very clear that Luke did not want to take the direction of Matthew who, though strongly underlining the role of Jesus as teacher, follows Mark in depicting Jesus first of all as preacher of repentance (Matt 4,17: "Jesus began to preach and say, 'Repent...'"). Granting that Luke consciously wanted this first image of Jesus to be that of teacher, did he want to ignore the figure Mark creates by his positioning Jesus first of all as one who preached repentance? It seems rather that Luke, having laid the foundation for God's call to repentance in the presentation of John the Baptist, assumes this concern for repentance into the larger framework of his Gospel, in which what has been begun with repentance is to be fulfilled by perseverance in the "deeds of repentance" (Acts 26,20); thus, Jesus's effort is focused on that teaching which is meant to preserve the repentance of the one who has come to believe in him. Indeed, Luke's concern, as is evidenced by the amount of teaching which makes up the journey motif of the Gospel and by the emphasis on the "teaching" throughout Acts, is to provide for the repentant the wisdom which will bring him to the fullness of salvation. In this way, Jesus incorporates the call to repentance as the first step of the process for which he, as savior, is responsible. Teaching, for Luke, indeed plays a major part in Jesus's role as savior.

Luke has no problem in using the title "teacher" (*didaskalos*) for Jesus; indeed, he uses it fourteen times in the Gospel to designate Jesus, and many of these occurrences are independent of the Marcan source⁽⁹⁾. Jesus is called "Teacher" by both friend (the disciples, Luke 21,7) and foe (Luke 18,18; 19,39), by those in need (Luke 9,38; 10,25) and by Jesus about himself (Luke 22,11). It is true that the title is used once also of John (Luke 3,12), but, while it emphasizes how tightly bound together are the call to repentance and the learning of what is required by sincere repentance (Luke 3,10-14), one cannot, upon a full reading of the Gospel, confuse the identification of Jesus as teacher *par excellence*. Only one other time does Luke describe a person or persons as "teacher"; this occurs in the story of Jesus Found in the Temple (Luke 2,46). Luke's willingness to use the title here for people for whom he cares not to give the title at any later time is probably due to the fact that

⁽⁹⁾ Luke 4,15; 13,22; 19,47; 20,1; 21,31; 23,5.

it is Jesus who will surpass, as this Infancy Story suggests, the former teachers of Israel and become the only *didaskalos* of the mind of God.

Finally, Luke's work shows his determination to impress the reader with the teaching role of Jesus. Whether in general situations or in more concrete circumstances⁽¹⁰⁾, Luke stresses Jesus's consistent work of teaching. This concern with teaching carries over into the Acts of the Apostles, where the witnesses, throughout the entire book, persistently engage in teaching; it is not unintentional that the Acts ends on the note of Paul's "preaching the kingdom and teaching the matters concerning Christ Jesus, Lord" (Acts 28,31)⁽¹¹⁾.

In many ways, then, Luke impresses his reader with teaching roles both of Jesus and of his witnesses; these teachings are in great measure the guidelines by which the movement towards repentance is fulfilled and the activities of the persevering believer are described. Against this brief picture I have drawn about this major Lucan theme, one can understand why Luke, who uses the early years of Jesus as an introduction and clarification of the adult Jesus's being and activities, would include in his early stories an insight into and preparation for the future teacher of the teachers of Israel.

Consideration of v. 49

Let us now move to consider the second major statement about Jesus given in this episode of the Finding in the Temple. In response to his parents' anguished questions, Jesus responds, "Why is it that you have been searching for me? Did you not know that I must be in my Father's house?" (v. 49). The phrase "in my Father's house" is the most acceptable translation for the words *en tois tou patros mou*; yet, there is enough disagreement about this translation to make one pause in one's final preference⁽¹²⁾. What seems to favor most the translation "in my Father's house" from an internal point of view is that Jesus's parents are consistently pictured as looking *where* to find him. This "search" started "among their relatives and friends" (v. 44) of the homeward-bound caravan; their attention is then turned to another place, Jerusalem (v. 45). Finally, they found him in the Temple (v. 46). The verb used to characterize their actions is one which

⁽¹⁰⁾ Luke 4,31; 5,3.17; 6,6; 13,10.

⁽¹¹⁾ Luke begins Acts with a reminder of the Jesus who "did and taught" (1,1). The apostles are said to teach at 4,2.18; 5,21.25.28.42; 11,26; 15,35; 18,11.25; 20,20; 21,21.28; cf. the *didachē* of the apostles: 2,42; 5,28; 13,12.

⁽¹²⁾ Cf. BROWN, *Messiah*, 475-477 (v. 49); FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 443-444 (v. 49) and bibliographical references, 444; MARSHALL, *Luke*, 128-129 (v. 49). The classic and exhaustive treatment of the meaning of *en tois tou patros mou* is that of R. LAURENTIN, *Jésus au temple: Mystère de Pâques et foi de Marie en Luc 2,48-50* (ÉBib; Paris 1966) 38-72; Laurentin argues anew that the necessary translation is "chez mon Père", in *Les Évangiles de L'Enfance* (Paris 1982) 104.

looks to "place": *anazētein* (vv. 44.45); correspondingly, Mary's complaint is a continuation of this verb *odunōmenoi ezētoumen se* (v. 48), and Jesus's response is in terms of this verb *tí hoti ezēteite me...en...dei einai...* (v. 49). Moreover, Luke has set up this concern for "place" by having the reader very early alerted to this factor: *hupemeinen Iēsous ho pais en Ierousalēm* (v. 43). Thus, the manner of addressing the problem and the description of its resolution suggest that "place", and the search for it, is a main concern and that this central concern is relieved in the finding of Jesus "in my Father's house".

One might add here a second and auxiliary point. Luke has consciously arranged a sharp contrast by placing so close together Mary's phrasing "*your father and I*" (*ho patēr sou* – v. 48) and Jesus's phrasing "in the house of my Father" (*tou patros mou* – v. 49). The point of the contrast is that, if one follows out the logic implied in the fact that Jesus is son of God, one would know that the twelve-year-old child would be in his Father's house. The "where", then, is a derivative of the "who"; Jesus's identity indicates where he is to be found.

Why is Jesus "in his Father's house"?

Yet, for all the internal indication about the importance of "place", one wonders whether or not there is something more than just "place" to consider here. First, Mary's opening question to her child is expressed with emphasis on cause: "*Why* did you treat us in this way?" (*tí epoiēsas hēmin houtōs* – v. 48a). What is on her mind then is not only where the lost Jesus is, but what could have led him to separate himself from his parents. Secondly, there is the oddity of the phrase *en tois tou patrou*; though parallels are to be found in literature which justify the translation "in the house of..."⁽¹³⁾, such a parallel is not found in the rest of the Lucan work, whereas in the very same Finding in the Temple story there is the clear and simple usage *en tōi hierōi* (v. 46). Thirdly, there is the persistent history in exegesis which leans toward translating the phrase as "to be concerned with the affairs of my Father"; such persistence, even by some rather modern translations, is noteworthy, since it is exercised in full consciousness of the arguments to the opposite, and suggests greater attention to the sense of this phrase⁽¹⁴⁾. Fourthly, though the translation "in my Father's house" does justice to the primary concern about the "lostness" of Jesus and "where" he is to be found, it is not adequate to answer the question, why is Jesus willing to disrupt things so as to spend time in his true Father's house?

So, these four considerations suggest that the deeper significance of this Lucan story is to be found in the reason why Jesus is pictured as remaining

⁽¹³⁾ Cf., e.g., FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 443.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Cf. *The Jerusalem Bible* (New York 1966), which even in 1968 continued to translate the Greek as "... must be busy with my Father's affairs"; *The Bible* (London 1965); *La Sainte Bible* (Paris 1956).

in Jerusalem. What motive moves Luke to depict a Jesus lost to his parents? The reason which explains the loss of Jesus was that Jesus should foreshadow, albeit through the characteristics of a twelve-year-old, his future role as teacher of Israel. He is found, yes, in the Temple, but "seated among the teachers," "listening", "asking" (v. 46); while he "listened" to them, all who "listened" to him marvelled at his acumen and at his answers (v. 47). In v. 46 Jesus acts as a twelve-year-old of religious inclination might be expected to act: he sits, listens and asks questions. In v. 47 he is not the simple learner anymore: he is seen to have astounding ability and to ask astounding questions; at this point the reader sees most clearly the man in the boy, the one who will distinguish himself above all other teachers of Israel, the one who will be acknowledged "truly to teach the way of God" (Luke 20,21), the only one who "knows who the Father is" (Luke 10,22). It is through Luke's verse 47, a reason from within the story, that one sees most clearly the reason why Jesus delays in his Father's house.

I suppose I am saying ultimately that the way in which Luke has emphasized two elements of his story, Jesus's acumen and Jesus's sense of being with his True Father, leads me to integrate the two points rather than separate them; my assumption (and hope) is that I am not unduly stressing one element to the harm of the other — but the manner in which the story is told seems to me to argue that I am not. It is the son of God as teacher that Joseph and Mary found, a side of Jesus new to them.

Significance of v. 50

Mary and Joseph are said not to understand what Jesus has just said to them about the "necessity" of his being in the Temple (hence no need to look elsewhere for him) and the necessity for his being engaged in his Father's business (why else would he have left them?). That Mary had been informed only a chapter earlier of God's central intervention on the analogy of father does not mean that she is expected to understand the implications of that fatherhood⁽¹⁵⁾; her pondering "all these things" which happened at the time of the shepherds (Luke 2,19) and her and Joseph's wonder at all that Simeon had been saying about Jesus (Luke 2,33) show that Gabriel's announcement to Mary did not clarify everything about this child of hers. Here, too, then, is a further example of the gradual opening out to Mary (and to the reader) of the mystery involved in the coming of Jesus. Conceived, according to Gabriel, as king by God's intervention, reported by an angel to be Messiah, Lord and the Savior, prophesied by Simeon to be light of the Gentiles and glory of Israel, the salvation of all — Jesus is now revealed as one who will be concerned with the will of his Father, i.e., teaching the mind of God.

⁽¹⁵⁾ I make no attempt to posit in these pages a psychology of Mary other than what is harmonious with her role as a continuing character in Luke's narrative.

Not only did Mary and Joseph have no sufficient preparation for the teaching role of Jesus before this story of Jesus in the Temple; the way in which Jesus formulated his reason for leaving them ("it was necessary to be in the house of my Father") does nothing to remove the essential confusion of his parents. Only the actual playing out of the life of Jesus will eventually make clear all these factors which have come upon Mary and Joseph so suddenly in these two chapters; at the moment, they are overwhelmed as they try to put all the pieces together. This incomprehension is deliberately reported by Luke, for it, like so many other elements of the Infancy Narratives, reflects a future element of the adult life of Jesus and prepares the reader for it — here is foreshadowed the confusion about the identity of the adult Jesus. But not only does the lack of understanding of Mary and Joseph reflect in miniature the uncertainty of the adult Jesus's contemporaries; it also reflects the pondering which went on within the fledgling Christian communities about the great mystery in Jesus which has come upon them.

Conclusion: relationship of vv. 46-47 and v. 49

Thus, the episode of Jesus's being found in the Temple contains an intrinsic unity by which the two main elements of the story — Jesus's acumen among the teachers of Israel and his concern to be in his Father's house — are tightly linked. What Jesus does in his Father's house predicts the saving teaching which Jesus will give throughout the Gospel and which his disciples will continue to give throughout the Acts of the Apostles. A forecast of this salvific work, then, is the twelve-year-old Jesus's involvement with the teachers of Israel: a foreshadowing of his extensive activity in Galilee, on the road to Jerusalem and in the Temple itself.

If the teacher Jesus is at the heart of this episode, it is more easily explained why Luke has placed this story between two notices which stress the growth of this child in wisdom, a growth in the favor of God (Luke 2,40.52). It is also clear why Luke intended this story to be the final picture of Jesus drawn from the early years: one is ready now to encounter the element of Jesus's public life which has the most abiding influence on the Christian reader's life: the teaching of Jesus in which the repentant believer now perseveres till the coming of the Christ whom heaven holds (Acts 2,20-21), till the coming of the Son of Man to gather his own (Luke 21,27-28). Though Jesus exhibited tremendous powers by which he threw off the tyrannies of evil, he was rejected ultimately because he claimed wisdom to which the Law of Moses itself was subject. Only he knew the Father; it is in anticipation of this Jesus that Luke offers his reader the wondrous moment of Jesus found among the teachers of Israel.

Loyola University of Chicago
6525 N. Sheridan Rd.
Chicago, IL. 60626

John J. KILGALLAN S.J.

“Running” in Paul: The Midrashic Potential of Hab 2,2

It is widely understood⁽¹⁾ that the verb τρέχω and the noun δρόμος in Paul ought not, unless the contexts otherwise require, to depend on a metaphor taken from the stadium. Yet a vast number of commentators repeat the notion that Paul assumed that τρέχω implied “striving” and in a double metaphor. After the fashion of a cynic-stoic diatribe⁽²⁾ Paul would have utilised the metaphor of the stadium, well-known to his correspondents, but only as utilised by philosophers of his day, substituting the idea of “striving after virtue” for “striving after a crown”⁽³⁾. Some considerable time ago it was pointed out that the Hellenistic image of the stadium was entirely unsuitable for a Jewish preacher⁽⁴⁾; and, much more important, it was shown that there

⁽¹⁾ See NOACK (n. 4 below). O. BAUERNFEIND, “τρέχω”, TWNT VIII, 225-233 exaggerates in the other direction, but is unconvincing. He himself says (231) that the picture of the runner in the arena is a model only with reservations; the usual puzzlement is revealed. At 229 he cannot decide whether Hab 2,2 “running” means “spreading the gospel” (correct) or “reading with ease” (false). He cites F. HORST, *Die Zwölf* (HAT, 14; Tübingen 1964) ad loc. for the former view.

⁽²⁾ H. SCHLIER, *Der Brief an die Galater* (KKNT 7; Göttingen 1949) 36. H.-D. WENDLAND, *Die Literaturformen*, 356 and P. WENDLAND, *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur* (Tübingen 1912) 357 are commonly cited: H. LIETZMANN, *An die Römer*; H. W. SCHMIDT, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (THNT 6; Berlin 1963) 164-165; and BAUERNFEIND, “τρέχω”. PFITZNER (n. 7 below) is cited by E. KÄSEMANN, *An die Römer* (HNT 8a; Tübingen 1973) 255 (similarly in the E.T. [1980] 267). O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Römer* (KKNT 4; Göttingen 1963) 239 (with slight, and justified, hesitation). C. E. B. CRANFIELD, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans II* (Edinburgh 1983) 485, n. 1. A sophisticated, sensitive, and discontented interpretation appears at D. GUTHRIE, *Galatians* (London 1969) 79 (Paul’s failure to report would be a disqualification).

⁽³⁾ An illuminating comparison between Paul and cynic tradition: H. FUNKE, “Antisthenes bei Paulus”, *Hermes* 98 (1970) 459-471. Older expositors assumed that the metaphor at Gal 5,7 was taken directly from the arena (so Cornelius à Lapide).

⁽⁴⁾ Even in the Seleucid period the Games were reprobated for impudicity. See G. DELORME, *Gymnasion* (Paris 1960) 466-467; C. SPICQ, “Les éléments hellénistiques dans Saint Paul”, in *Da Tarso a Roma. Conferenze in occasione del XIX centenario della venuta di San Paolo a Roma* (Pubblicazioni dell’Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Scienze religiose 1; Milan 1963) 37-60 at p. 46. B. NOACK, “Celui qui court. Rom ix. 16”, *ST* 24 (1970) 113-116 naturally excludes 1 Cor 9,24-26 from the reflection. Schlatter, cited by Noack, doubted the derivation from the stadium. As Noack points out, Str.-B. III gives no parallel to Rom 9,16. As Bauernfeind agrees, the usage is bizarre enough (i.e. if one ignores Hab 2,2).

was an affinity between the MT of Hab 2,2 and the ideas that occur, often quite abruptly, in Paul⁽⁵⁾. That very important article from a scholar in the Prophets immediately appealed to several of his contemporaries, only to be rejected summarily by a recent commentator on Habakkuk⁽⁶⁾. It is the purpose of this Note to show that the last-cited scholar, though possibly justified in regard to the historical interpretation of the prophet, is not to be followed in respect of the midrashic potential of the verse in its content. It must always be remembered that the midrashist is not confined to the wider context of his biblical source, and is entitled to take multiple meanings from the words, even though other, inconsistent, interpretations coexist with his, or even emanate from himself, each being co-valid for the preacher's purposes. This is naturally not the standpoint of a modern commentator on the Old Testament. But it was Paul's and, as we shall see, Mark's.

The leading treatment of the Agon motif in Paul⁽⁷⁾ leaves us in no doubt but that Paul was not only familiar with the idea of the athlete-saint, but also utilised that metaphor at the well-known place in 1 Corinthians. But, alas, the author really assumed what remained to be proved. In one place Paul indeed used the metaphor of the Games, but even there he subordinated it to the leading idea of "running". If we recover this correctly we have advanced our understanding of Paul's motives at the celebrated confrontation at Jerusalem, we have made a significant contribution to expounding the notoriously difficult clause μή πως εἰς κενὸν τρέχω ἢ ἔδραμον, and, more important still, we have yet further proof that Paul assumed his readers and hearers had the same love of, and faith in, Holy Scripture that characterised him before he became a propagandist and long before he became a propagandist for Christianity.

I think we must first get rid of two ideas which could hold us up. Running in ancient history in celebration of the New Year and otherwise in fertility rites cannot be the *gremium* of the idea we are researching⁽⁸⁾; nor are we to assume that Paul's correspondents had instant recall of the alarming

⁽⁵⁾ J. M. HOLT, "So he may run who reads it", *JBL* 83 (1964) 298-302 demolishes the *communis opinio* as to the meaning of *yārūs* (p. 299). He actually points to 1 Cor 9,24-27 (of all places) and Phil 3,13-14 as cognate with Hab 2,2. Paul's abrupt (Noack, Bauernfeind) introduction of the verb is glossed over by commentators as if the overtones would be obvious to every hearer: no doubt they were if Paul himself had taught them the Habakkuk cliché.

⁽⁶⁾ Holt was agreed with by Brownlee (see n. 24) who none the less insists that the message must be carried by the runner (pp. 108, 111-112). Jörg Jeremias, C. A. Keller, and A. S. van der Woude accepted Holt's remonstrance (n. 5 above), but all are brushed aside by W. RUDOLPH, who cites them: *Micha - Nahum - Habakuk - Zephania* (KAT 13.3; Gütersloh 1975) 212 ("Das alles liegt dem Zusammenhang fern").

⁽⁷⁾ V. C. PFITZNER, *Paul and the Agon Motif. Traditional Athletic Imagery in the Pauline Literature* (NTS 16; Leiden 1967) 99-108. Hab 2,2 is *rejected* (as also Jer 23,21) at p. 107: "The immediate goal is always the unhindered effectiveness of the Word". This is too abstract in my opinion even for this versatile metaphor.

⁽⁸⁾ R. PATAI, *Man and Temple in Ancient Jewish Myth and Ritual* (London 1947) 72-79.

running which took place most days in the temple, running in order to be the first to tend and stir up the fire on the altar, a religious privilege which led to disorder⁽⁹⁾. As we shall see, even a significant psalm-verse in the LXX, suggested as the origin of the Pauline usage⁽¹⁰⁾, is not quite precisely relevant for us. These are "red herrings" and must not spoil our trail. The famous Hebrew word *rāšīm*, "runners", the élite corps of messengers, and bodyguards, several times noticed as relevant to our enquiry⁽¹¹⁾, is however within our subject.

The metaphor, which is intrusive and perplexing when first encountered at Gal 2,2; 5,7; Rom 9,16; and Phil 2,16, four separate places, all genuine, and none copied from another, appears to derive directly from Hab 2,2-4, itself capable of being interpreted in the light of the image of the runner. That, as is well known⁽¹²⁾, is the leading scriptural text behind the proposition that the Messiah will come at a definite time known to God (so clearly at Heb 10,35-39), that he must be waited for, the end of all apocalyptic, when he will save those who have waited in faith. Justification by faith (Gal 3,11; Rom 1,17) purports to be based on Hab 2,4d. The whole passage could have been used (as we shall see) for a collateral purpose by Mark (and conceivably even by Jesus himself) as by the Qumran community, while, as readers of *Biblica* may remember⁽¹³⁾ early Christians seem to have used Hab 2,4a-b to explain an aspect of one of Jesus' miracles. We shall in any case need the Hebrew original; and where, in the present writer's translations from Paul, certain words are italicised, the implication is that Habakkuk is being alluded to.

Hab 2,2 wayya' *anēnī* yhw̄h wayyomer k̄tōb h̄zōn ubā' ēr 'al-hallūhōt
l'ma' an yārūš qōrē' bō,
 3 kī 'ōd h̄zōn lammō' ēd w̄yāpēah laqqēš w̄lo' ȳkazzēb. 'im-yitma-
 h̄māh h̄akkēh-lō kī-bo' yābo' lo' ȳ'ahēr.
 4 hinneh 'upp̄lā lo' yāš'rā nāf̄šō bō w̄šadīq b̄' *mūnātō* yihyeh.

Readers have various versions to their hands, and will be aware⁽¹⁴⁾ that several mistranslations of v. 2 (*yārūš qōrē' bō*) are current. Some think that he who reads may read *fluently*; others that one who is actually on his feet

⁽⁹⁾ *m.Yoma* 2,1-2; *t.Ta'an* 2; *b.Yoma* 22a, 23a. Patai, *Man*, 73, 98, n. 73.

⁽¹⁰⁾ LXX Ps 118,32 was sponsored by NOACK, "Celui"; but the idea is not so much that of *running* (see the context) as of running on the *path* of the *commandments*, an imitative, not a preaching stance.

⁽¹¹⁾ 1 Sam 22,17; 2 Kgs 10,25, etc. Cf. 2 Sam 18,21-26. An interesting analysis of "runners" is given by BAUERNFEIND, "τρέχω", 228.

⁽¹²⁾ A. STROBEL, *Untersuchungen zum eschatologischen Verzögerungsproblem auf Grund der spätjüdisch-urchristliche Geschichte von Hab. 2,2 FF* (NTS 2; Leiden - Cologne 1961).

⁽¹³⁾ J. D. M. DERRETT, "Mark's technique: the Haemorrhaging Woman and Jairus' Daughter", *Bib* 63 (1982) 474-505, esp. 479-80.

⁽¹⁴⁾ HOLT, "'So he may run'", has convinced others: J. D. W. WATTS, *The Books of Joel... Zephaniah* (Cambridge 1975) 132 ("ready for a herald to carry it with speed").

and running can read the Vision at a glance⁽¹⁵⁾. But the order of the verbs makes the literal rendering certain, "so that he shall *run* who (ever) reads in it". Just as there is no evidence whatever that τρέχω can mean *by itself* "strive"⁽¹⁶⁾, so there is no evidence whatsoever that the word *rûs* can mean "do fluently": it means to hasten (cf. 1 Sam 17,17). An elegant example of modern translation-technique is to be found in the Bibbia Concordata (Monadori 1973):

Mi rispose il Signore dicendo: «Scrivi la visione, incidila chiaramente sulle tavolette, affinché vada spedito che la leggerà. Sì, la visione ha la sua data, s'affretta verso l'attuazione e non mentirà; se si fa attendere aspettala. Sì, certamente verrà senza tardare». Ecco, vien meno chi ha l'animo non retto, ma il giusto vive per la sua fede.

There are in fact various possible ways of construing this material. One is adopted at Heb 10,37-38: Hab 2,3c-d refers to the Messiah himself, while 4a-b refers to the believer, both affected by the Vision, the Messiah being its *object*, and the believer its *destination*. There is another possibility, that *bo' yābo'* (3d) relates to the Season (*qēṣ*); but no ancient author takes it in that way. The midrashist is offered yet another opportunity: the last three-quarters of v. 3, and the first half of v. 4, can be read as depending not on v. 2b *hāzôn* ("Vision"), but on v. 2d *qôre'* (read, as in 1QpHab, *ha-qôre'*, "the reader"). Both nouns being masculine, the verses may be taken in either way or in both. I now retranslate, applying what I claim to have been Paul's midrash:

And YHWH answered me and said, "Write the Vision and engrave it on the tablets in order that the reader (or reciter) may *run* [A, Σ τρέχη] (literally "hasten"). For the Vision is still for the assembly (or the feast), and he shall pant for breath (YHḥ), or speak (PWḥ), until the End (eschatological, or finishing-line), and he shall not *deceive* (or raise false hopes [cf. Mic 1,14 MT, LXX]). If he delays (or is delayed) wait for him, for he shall surely come; he (or "and he") shall not fall behind (or dally). Behold if his spirit is blown up ('PL) or faints ('LP, LXX ὑποστείληται, cf. Heb 10,38) it is not upright in him; yet the righteous shall live in his faith".

The writer of the Vision does not understand it himself, necessarily, and it is open to question whether the runner does: third parties will, those to whom he speaks and to whom he delivers it^(16a). The cognate but different

⁽¹⁵⁾ Even BROWN - DRIVER - BRIGGS, *Hebrew and English Lexicon*, consent to this error, persisted in by RUDOLPH, *Micha*. The idea that even a runner can read it attracted the Assembly's Divines (*Annotations* [London 1657]), and C. TAYLOR in the *Interpreter's Bible*, ad loc.

⁽¹⁶⁾ See the lexica, which are perfectly clear.

^(16a) See A. T. HANSON, *The Living Utterances of God. The New Testament Exegesis of the Old* (London 1983) 16. In Hanson's view 1 Pet 1,10-12 is indebted to a midrash on Hab 2,1-4 (ib., 140-141, also IDEM, *Studies in Paul's*

idea of one who *runs after righteousness* was acceptable to the Jewish mind⁽¹⁷⁾. Note Philo, *De Agric.* 176-177: "For it is difficult for the runners, as we may call them, after starting on the way to piety, to finish the whole course without stumbling, and without stopping to draw breath; for every man born meets ten thousand obstacles"⁽¹⁸⁾. This is not necessarily, or primarily, the running of a messenger; but it too is non-competitive (as at Heb 12,1.3.5.12-13). Habakkuk's "running" is directed towards the conveyance of the Vision, which derives from scripture, up to the Assembly who are about to hold a Feast. They wait at the "finish" (cf. Heb 11,40, 12,22-24). The runner may pant for breath, and is in danger of being "blown", "fainting"; but he will not falsify God's hopes (cf. Qoh 9,11). LXX Hab 2,3: ἀνατελεῖ εἰς πέρας, καὶ οὐκ εἰς κενόν (the Vision rises up at the goal, and not in vain). Πέρας means both "boundary" and "purpose" and is an inspired rendering of *qēs*. It is the runner's faith which enables him to persist to the goal. Now for Paul.

At 2 Thess 3,1-3 Paul asks his brothers to pray for him in order that the Word of the Lord itself should *run* (Ps 147,15 [LXX 147,4]) and Paul should be protected from people who lack *faith*, since God himself is *faithful* and will strengthen him.

At Gal 2,2 Paul says he journeyed according to Revelation (i.e. his *vision*; cf. Gal 1,12; Rev 1,1). He reported (or recounted)⁽¹⁹⁾ to the authorities at Jerusalem the gospel which he was preaching and subsequently preached amongst the gentiles, privately to those "notabilities", so that he should not, somehow, be *running*, or have *run* (thitherto) *in vain*. Notoriously difficult to construe, those words seem to imply that unless they received that report

Technique and Theology [London 1974] 286, n. 6). He refers to Dodd and others at *Studies*, 218-219. C. H. DODD, before the discovery of Qumran, was clear that Hab 2,3-4 was a standard NT source: *According to the Scriptures. The Substructure of New Testament Theology* (London 1965) 49-51. After that discovery the idea was confirmed: W. D. DAVIES, *The Setting of the Sermon on the Mount* (Cambridge 1964) 218.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Ps 119,32 (LXX Ps 118,32 ὁδὸν ἐντολῶν σου ἔδραμον). *b.Ber.* 28b ('*anī rās ḥayye ha-'olām ha-ba'*...). 1 Clem 6,2 (ἐπὶ τὸν τῆς πίστεως βέβαιον δρόμον κατήντησαν) evidently has a Judaeo-Christian timbre. Jewish antipathy to the Games did not prevent *running* (non-competitive) being evaluated positively in that context. 4 Macc 14,5 is particularly interesting since there the themes of the athlete and martyr have coalesced.

⁽¹⁸⁾ So the Loeb ed. translation: F. H. COLSON and G. H. WHITAKER, *Philo* III (London - Cambridge, Mass. 1960) 201. If one suggested Philo knew the Habakkuk passage one would astonish specialists in Philo, who rate low both his knowledge of Hebrew and his interests in the Prophets. Bauernfeind appears to have overlooked this passage (with its δρομεῖς, δρόμον), but his remark that neither Philo nor Josephus uses τρέχω in a religious sense is significant.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Ἀνατίθημι was used of submitting, rather than merely imparting, a formal and reliable report: Aristoph., *Nubes* 143; 2 Macc 3,9; Plut., *Mor.* 772D. Since the word also meant "dedicate" one cannot avoid the impression of an official communication *ex debito*. The usage at LXX Mic 7,5 is ambiguous. Προσθεθήμεν at Gal 1,16 (cf. 17) is agreed to mean "conferred", but it could also mean "reported (the Vision)".

then and there Paul would have failed. We can, I submit, discard both the commonly favoured interpretations (Paul neither feared Jerusalem's reprobation, nor the collapse of a mission which without Jerusalem's assent would have fallen apart into two ethnic churches)⁽²⁰⁾. The fact was, I submit, that unless he had carried the word-for-word accurate *reading* of the gospel in *scriptural* terms, as his *Vision*, he had not been *running*, in the Habakkuk sense, at all! They were, as it were, waiting for him to arrive! If he had failed to meet that "assembly" he would have run εἰς κενόν, in vain. The gospel, it is insinuated, is actually preached to them too. The question of running in vain is handled in a helpful passage at Isa 49,4. Even those who labour apparently in vain as God's servants (*ἔριq*, there LXX κενῶς, though frequently εἰς κενόν) have a reward promised to them; and God has promised that his elect shall not weary themselves in vain (LXX Isa 65,23 οὐ κοπιήσουσιν εἰς κενόν). This is enough encouragement for a missionary.

The point seems to be pursued at Gal 5,7. A direct reference to Hab 2,4 has occurred at Gal 3,11. Now Paul complains of his converts' *faltering*: "You were *running* well — who tripped you, so that you do not *believe* the truth?" They are, it seems, no longer *upright*, because Satan (1 Thess 3,5) has tripped them up. For he that *believes* (says Isa 28,16) shall not stumble nor vacillate. The previous verse proves that this is the metaphor. Gal 5,4-6 requires the Galatians to cease seeking for justification by the Law, to resume *faith*, and to *wait*: "... for we, by the spirit, *await* eagerly the hoped-for righteousness on the basis of *faith*... You were *running* well..." (after reading what *he* had *written* to them?).

The image of the stadium occurs at 1 Cor 9,24-26. The race-track itself is mentioned. Yet notice how inept the metaphor is! Paul draws attention to the fact himself. All racers run, but one alone obtains the prize. All Christians must run to be prizewinners. Here the interest is not centred in the expectant crowd at the finishing-post, the "tape", but in the quality of the running; all are potential "winners". Every athlete goes into training⁽²¹⁾. Secular competitors compete for a perishable crown, but "we" compete for an imperishable one. Compete against whom? Satan? No sooner has Paul opened this idea than he reverts to the other metaphor: "Therefore I *run* in such a way as not to *run* inconspicuously. I box like one who is not merely

⁽²⁰⁾ Commentators, relying on Gal 1,16-17, insist that Paul did not need the approbation of the authorities at Jerusalem. His attitude is often expressed as an indirect question, "Have I really been running in vain?" (ironical). J. BLIGH, *Galatians* (London 1969) 153 ("of course not"). Similarly G. G. FINDLAY, *Epistle to the Galatians* (London 1891) 104. Yet something is missing in this comforting interpretation. F. F. BRUCE, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (NIGTC; Exeter 1982) 111, raises the problem of the fissiparous effect of Jerusalemite hesitation to agree; the gospel would be hindered by this.

⁽²¹⁾ HORACE, *A. P.* 412-14; EPICT. 3.15,3-5; DIO CHRYS. 28, esp. 9-10.12. In all fairness one must admit that it was the general level of excellence achieved by the trainees that made competitive sports, in which only one could *win*, tolerable (LUCIAN, *Anacharsis* 13,15). This point of view was seemingly punctured by Alexander (the Great) at PLUT., *Mor.* 179D, 331B.

(in training) shadow-boxing”⁽²²⁾. Paul’s race must be conspicuous in public (he is not concerned with human competition) because a message has to be received by everyone therefrom and thereby. No doubt Heb 12,1 uses the Agon motif; but it plays no further role in Paul.

At Rom 9,1 the question is whether Paul is to be believed in his message about merit: he says he does not *lie*; then comes the message that the Promise is to be obtained by *faith* alone (9,32). No amount of effort on the part of the believer will effectuate this (9,16): ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ, “So, then, it is not of him that intends, nor (even) of him that *runs*, but of God that has mercy”; the faithful children of the Promise receive it neither through hoping, nor by running. The word τρέχω has been chosen in preference to σπεύδω, ἀθλῶ, and κοπιῶ (the latter clearly known to Paul [Col 1,29]) for some reason, and it is most probably because those that have read the Vision and therefore gained hope are called upon to run, and “running” is therefore appropriate to one who carried the mission to others. Even the missionary cannot *claim* salvation on the basis of his own effort. To make τρέχω mean “strive” we must add another verb, e.g. κοπιῶ, to it.

At Phil 2,16 we hear of Paul’s correspondents’ *receiving* the Word of *Life*, a matter of pride (“swollen” at Hab 2,4 can also mean “proud”) for Paul on the day of Christ, since he can claim that he has not *run* εἰς κενόν (Hab 2,3 LXX) nor striven εἰς κενόν (cf. 1 Thess 3,5; Isa 49,4; 65,23), with a double allusion to Hab 2. Note ἐκοπίασα added to ἔδραμον, not only drawing in the Isaiah passage but also proving that “running” by itself does not mean “striving”^(22a).

The metaphorical term δρόμος (running) became a cliché⁽²³⁾. It signifies the career of a preacher. It is certainly not competitive running. John the Baptist was certainly a messianic visionary, so the word is appropriate to him. Paul speaks of his “course” exactly as the ministry of the Word, testimony both to the gospel and to the grace of God which provided it. After Paul’s time it was attributed to him as credit that he fought the good fight and actually finished his *course*, keeping the *faith*.

We must now consider Hab 2,2-4 in quite another exegetical milieu. We have seen that the *reader* of the deeply engraved scriptural Vision starts *running*. His goal is the *Assembly*. Or can Hab 2,3 be taken exclusively of the Vision, its own haste and its own faithfulness? In that case “runs” is left in the air. Will the reader *run away*? Why should he? That depends on the nature of the Vision. Much of it is sinister. Gal 2,6-17 is of this order. The righteous, warned by the Vision, may flee from the World. When all

⁽²²⁾ PHILO, *De Cherub.* 81; DIO CHRYS. 28,2.

^(22a) Shown by the anthology: (D. DÜBNER, ed.) *Epigrammatum anthologia palatina* II (Paris 1872), xi. 56 (pp. 294-295) τί γὰρ αὐριον, ἢ τί τὸ μέλλον – οὐδεις γινώσκει. Μὴ τρέχε, μὴ κοπία. MENANDER, *Mon.* 51 ἀνὴρ ἄβουλος εἰς κενὸν μοχθεῖ τρέχων.

⁽²³⁾ Acts 13,25; 20,24; 2 Tim 4,7; Ign., Polyc. 1,2; 1 Clem 6,2.

those threats are at an end — but not before — haste and confusion are superfluous (Isa 52,12). Meanwhile the runner who saves himself saves the gospel. Now Mark explained, in a condensed form, the Vision of Christ himself at Mark 13. The words at Mark 13,14 par. ὁ ἀναγινώσκων νοεῖτω have been taken universally as an interpolation. But if they are Mark's allusion to Habakkuk they are not. The idea is of the *reader* (see Isa 29,1-12!) who correctly reads the dreadful sign of those times, and goes at once to the mountains for safety. That is exactly what Mark says. The image is of reading signs (cf. Matt 16,3), which have actually been consigned to scripture as, in this case, the prophecy of Daniel (9,27 etc.) was. Having recognised, in the facts of contemporary history, that which Daniel had foretold in writing — Daniel, the great reader of signs himself — the bearer of the gospel makes for the mountains: cf. Gen 14,10; 1 Macc 2,28. The image is this: as long as the hill-forts hold out it is in vain that invaders swarm over the plain; or, in biblical idiom, God's vengeance against Sodom leaves Lot, in his cave, intact. See Gen 19,17.19.20-30, cf. 25 (Zech 14,5).

That Hab 2,3 advised *flight* to the reader of the Vision is proved by 1QpHab VII.3-4, XI.5-6. 1QpHab VII.3-4 has been misunderstood by some because the quotation of Hab 2,3 in the previous column⁽²⁴⁾ has been translated with the erroneous understanding of *yārûs*⁽²⁵⁾. The Teacher of Righteousness was one of the few who could correctly read the signs of the times, and he fled and regrouped his community in Damascus. *Running* was certainly a response to *reading*. Mark and Qumran saw the Habakkuk *running*, which was originally the running of a divine messenger⁽²⁶⁾, as counselling running for safety and thereby preserving the gospel for future generations (cf. Isa 30,8). This is a highly particularistic midrash, but we know it existed. In *faith* one *runs* and eventually reaches, in spite of stumbling and fainting, the destined goal, which is an Assembly, one notices, and that too in a posture to celebrate a feast, naturally the Messianic Banquet. The Messianic Kingdom will surely come, without fail (Matt 3,11; 11,3; 21,9; Heb 10,37; 1 Cor 11,26; Rev 22,30) but not unless the gospel is preached by a "runner".

High St., Blockley
Near Moreton-in-Marsh
Gloucestershire GL56 9EX
Great Britain

J. Duncan M. DERRETT

⁽²⁴⁾ J. C. TREVER, *Scrolls from Qumrân Cave I* (Jerusalem 1972) 154-157 (columns VI, VII). J. CANTERA ORTIZ DE URBINA, *El Comentario de Habacuc de Qumran* (Madrid - Barcelona 1960) 35, l. 1 read LQ8; E. LOHSE, *Die Texte aus Qumran Hebräisch und Deutsch* (München 1964) 234-235; M. DELCOR, *Essai sur le Midrash d'Habacuc* (Paris 1951); W. H. BROWNLEE, *The Midrash Pesher of Habakkuk* (SBLMS 24; Missoula 1979) 107-113.

⁽²⁵⁾ DELCOR, *Essai*, 25 (VI. 15 "afin que couramment on lise"); similarly at VII. 3). CANTERA, *Comentario*, renders VII. 3 correctly: "para que se dé prisal el que lo lea".

⁽²⁶⁾ Ps 147,15; Jer 23,21.

Numbers 21,30b in the Light of the Ancient Versions and Ugaritic

The Song of Heshbon (Num 21,27b-30) in the MT ends with the following lines, (v. 30a) *wannîrām 'abad ḥešbôn 'ad dîbôn* (v. 30b) *wannaššîm 'ad nōpah 'āšer 'ad mēdēbā*, "We shot at them, Heshbon was destroyed as far as Dibon, (v. 30b) and we laid waste as far as Nophah, which lies near Medeba". The exact meaning of v. 30a is controverted⁽¹⁾, but it is clear that it treats of destruction between Heshbon and Dibon. V. 30b, which forms the subject of this note, is generally thought to be severely corrupted⁽²⁾. It concludes a poem, yet does not look poetic. Since Medeba lies between Heshbon and Dibon, the words, "as far as Nophah, which lies near Medeba" would seem to imply some emphasis, and yet nothing is known of Nophah⁽³⁾. Further, *wannaššîm*, apparently imperfect consecutive hiphil from *šmm*, lacks the expected object⁽⁴⁾. One might derive the vocable from a root *yšm**, possibly found in Ezek 6,6⁽⁵⁾, but this is very uncertain and the *yod* or *waw* which one would normally expect after the preformative is missing, so that *scriptio defectiva* must be assumed. It would be simpler to take *šmm* as the root, provided that an object can be found, as we hope to show.

The LXX translates, καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ἔτι προσεξέκαυσαν πῦρ ἐπὶ Μωαβ. "And the women have further kindled a fire against Moab", reading 'ēš,

⁽¹⁾ Cf. P. D. HANSON, "The Song of Heshbon and David's *Nîr*", *HTR* 61 (1968) 297-320; HALAT 658b.

⁽²⁾ See HANSON, *HTR* 61 (1968) 297; G. B. GRAY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Numbers* (ICC; Edinburgh 1903) 304; N. H. SNAITH, *Leviticus and Numbers* (New Century Bible; London 1967) 285; M. NOTH, *Das 4. Buch Mose. Numeri* (ATD 7; Göttingen 1977) 141 (E.T. *Numbers. A Commentary* [Old Testament Library; London 1968] 161); D. K. STUART, *Studies in Early Hebrew Meter* (HSM 13; Missoula 1976) 95.

⁽³⁾ The site of biblical Heshbon is uncertain but may be Jalūl. Tell Ḥešbān shows no evidence of having suffered from major assault, cf. R. S. BORAAS and L. T. GERATY, "The Long Life of Tell Ḥešbān, Jordan", *Archaeology* 32 (1979) 10-20, esp. 13a. Jalūl is 5 km. east of Madaba, cf. R. IBACH, "An Intensive Surface Survey at Jalūl", *AUSS* 16 (1978) 215-222. The Israelites may have transferred the name of the destroyed city to Tell Ḥešbān when it was built in the period of the Judges (= Iron Age I), see L. T. GERATY, "Ḥešbān (Heshbon)", *RB* 82 (1975) 579.

⁽⁴⁾ *TOB* (= *Traduction œcuménique de la Bible*) does propose an object for *šmm*, "tout ce qui s'étend jusqu'à Madeba". This is perhaps possible, but the translation is free, and the implied ellipsis of the direct object is grammatically difficult.

⁽⁵⁾ Cf. *BDB* 445a s.v. [*yāšam*]; F. ZORELL, *Lexicon hebraicum Veteris Testamenti* (Rome 1984) 337a s.v. *yāšēm**.

"fire" for MT 'āšer, replacing "Medeba" by "Moab" and interpreting consonantal *wnšym* as a noun. This offers little improvement over the MT and does not demonstrate a different *Vorlage*, any more than do the other Versions⁽⁶⁾. They seem to have had the same consonantal text before them but were unable to understand it. The question then arises, was the text already corrupt when the ancient translators began their work? Or is the consonantal text sound? The first question is usually answered in the affirmative, the second in the negative, and various reconstructions are proposed⁽⁷⁾. It is, nevertheless, possible that the consonantal text is sound but that the tradition misunderstood it.

The vocable 'ad occurs three times in v. 30, as it appears thrice in vv. 24+26. M. Noth maintains that the information given in v. 26 depends on the following "song"⁽⁸⁾ and that the narrative is in any case later than the "song"⁽⁹⁾. It is possible that the repetition of 'ad in a local sense in vv. 24+26 is deliberate, preparing for the poem. This could imply that the editor understood each 'ad in v. 30 as bearing the same meaning. One may, however, still wonder whether it is likely that a poem should feature the well-known preposition 'ad, "towards" three times in the short space of a verse, unless some special effect was intended. It is the apparent lack of any literary reason that raises a doubt over the threefold 'ad.

The hiphil verb *wannaššim* desires an object and 'ad can fulfil this role if understood as a noun. C. H. Gordon lists a Ugaritic noun 'd II, "throne room", citing *UT* 127: 22 (*KTU* 1.16:VI:22), although the fine verbal, nominal and prepositional parallelism, including a fourfold *l*, seems to favour Dahood's proposal, "chair, throne", *yīb.krt.l 'dh* (23) *yīb.l ksi mlk* (24) *l nht.l kht.drkt*, "Kirta sits down on his chair, sits down on his royal throne, on the peaceful bench of his authority"⁽¹⁰⁾. Dahood has also proposed that this word may be present in a number of biblical texts⁽¹¹⁾. He puts forward the following etymology: *y'd* connotes jurisdiction, hence derivatives from this root could denote, "seat, throne"⁽¹²⁾. In other words, the term connoting the

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. HANSON, *HTR* 61 (1968) 306.

⁽⁷⁾ Consult the authors cited in n. 2.

⁽⁸⁾ NOTH, *Numeri*, 143 (E.T. *Numbers*, 164).

⁽⁹⁾ NOTH, *Numeri*, 141 (E.T. *Numbers*, 161).

⁽¹⁰⁾ C. H. GORDON, *Ugaritic Textbook* (AnOr 38; Rome 1965) 453b Glossary no. 1814; M. DAHOOD, *Psalms II 51-100* (AB 17; Garden City 1973) 81; G. DEL OLMO LETE, *Mitos y leyendas de Canaán según la tradición de Ugarit. Textos, versión y estudio* (Fuentes de la ciencia bíblica 1; Madrid 1981) 321.

⁽¹¹⁾ See DAHOOD, *Psalms II*, 81. Scholars who have accepted some of the proposals include J. D. SHENKEL, "An Interpretation of Ps 93,5", *Bib* 46 (1965) 404-409; L. SABOTTKA, *Zephania. Versuch einer Neuübersetzung mit philologischem Kommentar* (BibOr 25; Rome 1972) 225-229; B. ZERR, *The Psalms. A New Translation* (New York 1979) 129, 200, 210, 251. HALAT 744 considers Dahood's examples doubtful but admits that Isa 57,15 is possible, "möglich allenfalls für Js 57,15".

⁽¹²⁾ DAHOOD, *Psalms II*, 342. E. T. MULLEN ("The Divine Witness and the Davidic Royal Grant: Ps 89:37-38", *JBL* 102 [1983] 211-213) rejects this sense of 'ad as lacking support in the ancient Versions and an etymology but does not

act of determining, designating can come to denote the place where this is done. Compare *mišpāt*, "justice, right", which can signify "court of judgment"⁽¹³⁾. A similar derivative may be 'ēšā, "counsel, council" from y'š, "advise, counsel"⁽¹⁴⁾.

Hence we suggest that in Num 21,30b the desired object of *wannaššim* is 'ad, "chair, throne": "We have destroyed the throne". The next word *nōpah* need no longer be taken as a place name, otherwise unattested. The LXX translates, ποσεξέκασαν, "kindled", apparently connecting the consonants with *nph*, "breathe, blow"⁽¹⁵⁾. We would vocalize *nōpēah*, "breathing", a qal participle, whose object may be concealed in the following 'āšer.

The *resh* of 'āšer bears the Masoretic *punctum extraordinarium*, showing that the scribes questioned it at a very early date. The Samaritan Pentateuch and the LXX read 'ēš, "fire", and we would therefore render, "We have destroyed the throne breathing fire". The phrase, "the throne breathing fire" lacks an exact parallel, but the idea is well attested. Thus in Dan 7,9-10 the throne of the Ancient of Days is of flame which issues forth (see too Ezek 1,26-27; Rev 4,5). Num 21,30b would then look back to the beginning of the Song, v. 28, "Lo! A fire went forth from Heshbon", yielding an inclusion for the poem.

The *resh* may be transferred to the next word, giving *rā'ad*, "trembled, quaked"; hence, "Medeba quaked". The verb *rā'ad* occurs only three times elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible, in Ps 104,32 (qal); Dan 10,11; Ezra 10,9 (hiphil), but two of its appearances are connected with fire; so Ps 104,32, "He who gazes upon the earth and it trembles (*wattir'ad*), touches the mountains and they smoke" (see too Dan 10,11, compare v. 6).

rā'ad balances the similar sounding 'abad in v. 30a, forming an inclusion for the verse. Also to be noted is the parallelism between *wannaššim* and 'abad, the two verbs again appearing in parallel in Jer 4,9.

At this point a question may be raised. Cities are normally feminine, but in our translation Medeba is treated as masculine. The same question arises in relation to 'abad (but see below). It is a characteristic of the masculine gender that it is used of whatever is dangerous and savage⁽¹⁶⁾, and here Medeba is parallel to "the throne breathing fire", so that it is the violent oppressor who is now trembling. W.G.E. Watson points out that the masculine gender may be used for effect⁽¹⁷⁾. Here this gender underlines the

consider Dahood's proposal. His own is based on Arabic, but a Northwest Semitic etymology seems preferable.

⁽¹³⁾ Cf. *BDB*, 1048 a-b.

⁽¹⁴⁾ See M. DAHOOD, *Psalms I 1-50* (AB 16; Garden City 1966) 1; W. H. IRWIN, *Isaiah 28-33. Translation with Philological Notes* (BibOr 30; Rome 1977) 61.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See too *NAB*; *NEB*; *RSV*; NOTH, *Numeri*, 141 (E.T. *Numbers*, 161).

⁽¹⁶⁾ Cf. *GKC* Sect. 122h n. 3, who quotes K. ALBRECHT, "Das Geschlecht der hebräischen Hauptwörter", *ZAW* 16 (1896) 120.

⁽¹⁷⁾ W. G. E. WATSON, "Gender-Matched Synonymous Parallelism in the OT", *JBL* 99 (1980) 324, 341.

violence of the former ruler of Medeba. Furthermore, names of cities can be masculine, if formed with a masculine noun, as, for instance, is Bethel. Medeba according to a plausible view is formed with *mê*, "water" which is masculine⁽¹⁸⁾. The use of the masculine gender for Medeba would therefore seem to be fully appropriate in the context. V. 30b now reads as a bicolon,

	Words	Syllables
<i>wannaššîm 'ad nōpēah 'ēš</i>	4	8
(MT <i>nōpah 'āšer</i>)		
<i>rā'ad mēdēbā'</i>	2	5
(MT <i>'ad mēdēbā'</i>)		

Such an understanding of v. 30b harmonizes with Hanson's proposal for v. 30a, "and their dominion (*wēnîrām* for MT *wannîrām*) perished", as being the Vorlage of the Vulgate and Targumim, although he then emends the text for reasons of prosody⁽¹⁹⁾. The syllable count is five, as is that of the next colon, *hešbôn 'ad dîbôn*, so that the syllable pattern of the whole verse would be, 5:5:8:5, and the word pattern, 2:3:4:2. The third colon may look over-long, but changing the pattern in the last unit is a stylistic device for indicating the conclusion⁽²⁰⁾. V. 30b then translates,

"And we destroyed the throne breathing fire,
Medeba quaked".

50 Mount Pleasant Drive
P.O. Mount Pleasant
Harare
Zimbabwe

R. ALTHANN, S. J.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Consult S. SEGERT, "Die Sprache der moabitischen Königsinschrift", *ArOr* 29 (1961) 216-217, 249. J. BLAU ("Short Philological Notes on the Inscription of Meša", *Maarav* 2/2 [1980] 149) dissents, arguing that if the Hebrews had "derived *mē* in *mēdēbā'* from 'water,' they would have spelled it, in a manner consistent with place names beginning with *mē* 'water' (cf. *mē zāhāb* Gen 36:39, 1 Chr 1:50, *mē hayyarqōn* Josh 19:46), as a separate word: *mē dēbā'*". But can we be even fairly sure of this? Compare *lō dēbār* (2 Sam 9,4,5; *lō' dēbār* in 17,27) with *līdēbīr* (Josh 13,26), places usually identified (see too Amos 6,13). Consult J. A. SOGGIN, *Joshua. A Commentary* (Old Testament Library; London 1972) 151 (translated from the French, *Le Livre de Josué* [Commentaire de l'Ancien Testament Va; Neuchâtel 1970] with revisions by the author). Or consider *benyāmīn*, normally written as one word, but as two words in 1 Sam 9,1: *bin-yāmīn*, read as one word by the *qērē*. In Jer 6,1, however, the Leningrad Codex vocalizes בְּנֵימִן, showing that two words were read.

⁽¹⁹⁾ HANSON, *HTR* 61 (1968) 304. The subject of 'ābad is now masculine.

⁽²⁰⁾ Cf. A. MIRSKY, "A Stylistic Device for conclusion in Hebrew", *Semitics* 5 (1977) 9-23.

On Vowel Dissimilation in Hebrew*

In 1868, Lazarus Geiger noted that two successive *o*- and/or *u*-vowels cannot appear in Biblical Hebrew⁽¹⁾. Fifteen years later, Philippi adduced several examples in support of Geiger's claim, such as **tôkôn* > *tîkôn* "middle", **hûšôn* > *hîšôn* "external", and **lûlô'* > *lûlē'* "if not"⁽²⁾. Thereafter, a rule of vowel dissimilation was established⁽³⁾.

There are several problems with this "rule", however. The direction of dissimilation is unclear; dissimilation can apparently be either regressive or progressive without any restrictions⁽⁴⁾. Further, a number of forms contradict this rule. In contrast, for example, to **tôkôn* > *tîkôn* "middle", *qôlôt* "voices" and *dôrôt* "generations" show the non-dissimilated sequence

*I thank Professors Franz Rosenthal and Laura Kalman for commenting upon an earlier form of this paper, and the American Council of Learned Societies for its support.

The transcription of Hebrew vowels follows the "seven color" scheme. With the exception of *pathah*, each vowel can be long (\bar{V}) or short (V). The circumflex (\hat{V}) is reserved for historical contraction (e.g. **aw* > \hat{o}), although the BH outcome of such contraction is a simple long vowel ($*\hat{V} \rightarrow \bar{V}$). The transcription, then, is largely phonetic rather than orthographic.

Finally, the following symbols will be used:

- + : morphemic boundary
- " : pausal accent
- ' : contextual accent.

⁽¹⁾ Lazarus GEIGER, *Ursprung und Entwicklung der menschlichen Sprache und Vernunft* I (Stuttgart 1868) 431 n.43. See also Heinrich EWALD, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Bundes* (Göttingen 1863) §§ 108c, 163c; and, more descriptively, Justus OLSHAUSEN, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Braunschweig 1861) § 182f.

⁽²⁾ F. W. M. PHILIPPI, "Ist מן accadisch-sumerischen Ursprungs?", *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 14 (1883) 178.

⁽³⁾ Friedrich KÖNIG, *Historisch-kritisches Lehrgebäude der hebräischen Sprache* II/1 (Leipzig 1895) § 129.3bß; Carl BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* I (Berlin 1908) § 94r; GKC §§ 27w, 68c n. 2; GKB I § 27b; Hans BAUER and Pontus LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache* (Halle 1922) § 21k; Paul JOÜON, *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* (Rome 1923) § 29h; Rudolf MEYER, *Hebräische Grammatik* I (Berlin 1966) § 27.3; and Joshua BLAU, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew* (Wiesbaden 1976) § 8.4. See also August MÜLLER, "מִן", *TSK* 65 (1892) 178; Jacob BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen* (Leipzig 1894) xxix-xxx; Eduard Y. KUTSCHER, *Words and Their History* (Jerusalem 1961) 100 (in Hebrew); IDEM, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQ Isa^a)* (Leiden 1974) 53, 452; and Klaus BEYER, *Althebräische Grammatik* (Göttingen 1969) 38.

⁽⁴⁾ Stated most directly by BERGSTRÄSSER, GKB I § 27b.

ō...ō⁽⁵⁾. While **hūṣōn* > *hīṣōn* "external" seems to exhibit this dissimilation, *hūṣōt* "streets" does not; nor does *nəpūṣōtēm* "you were dispersed" (Ezek 11,17; 20,34.41). And although **busrō* > *bīsrō* "his ripening grapes" (Job 15,33) may support this phonological rule, 'oznō "his ear", *gōbhō* "his height", and *hōlyō* "his illness" do not. These counterexamples, as well as the unspecified direction of dissimilation, suggest that this rule should be reexamined. Does BH exhibit a sound change whereby two consecutive (mid-) high back vowels dissimilate, either regressively or progressively, into a (mid-) high back and (mid-) high non-back vowel⁽⁶⁾?

*The dissimilation of *u.* Several words exhibit the change **u* > *i* in a closed unaccented syllable when followed by *o* < **u* or *ō* < **u/ā*:

* <i>šuppur</i> ⁽⁷⁾		→ BH <i>šippōr</i> "bird" ⁽⁸⁾
* <i>šubbult</i> (cf. Arab. and Akk.)		→ <i>šibboleṭ</i> "ear of grain"
* <i>yullād</i> ⁽⁹⁾	→ * <i>yullōd</i> ⁽¹⁰⁾	→ BH <i>yillōd</i> "new born" ⁽¹¹⁾
* <i>rummān</i> (cf. Aram. and Arab. ⁽¹²⁾)	→ * <i>rummōn</i>	→ <i>rimmōn</i> "pomegranate". ⁽¹³⁾

Although these words appear to reflect a rule of vowel dissimilation, an alternate derivation renders this rule questionable. All four words exhibit the

⁽⁵⁾ *qōlōt* and *dōrōt*, however, reflect different proto-forms than that assumed for *tikōn*.

⁽⁶⁾ For the formulation, cf. R. C. STEINER, "Yuqattil, Yaqattil, or Yiqattil: D-Stem Prefix-Vowels and a Constraint on Reduction in Hebrew and Aramaic", *JAOS* 100 (1980) 515.

⁽⁷⁾ BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 148; and BAUER-LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, § 61fy.

⁽⁸⁾ Perhaps *qippōd* "owl" (Arab. *qunfuḍ*) belongs here (so, e.g., BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung*, xxix; GKB I § 27b; and BAUER-LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, § 61fy). In BH, however, Arab. *ḍ* does not usually correspond to a *daleth*; cf. C. RABIN, "La correspondance *D* hébreu - *Ḍ* arabe", *Mélanges Marcel Cohen* (ed. D. COHEN) (The Hague-Paris 1970) 290-297, esp. 296.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. JOÜON, "Études de morphologie hébraïque", *Bib* 1 (1920) 360.

The doubled *lamedh* must be original, since **qutāl* > BH *qetōl* (BAUER - LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, §§ 611β-nβ). Yet it is unlikely that *yillōd* developed from **yallād* (see HALAT, p. 394b), since the shift **a* > *i* is stalled when the following consonants are geminate (J. L. MALONE, "A Hebrew Flip-Flop Rule and its Historical Origins", *Lingua* 30 [1972] 428).

⁽¹⁰⁾ For this intermediate stage, see KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 455.

⁽¹¹⁾ The derivation of *qimmōš* "weeds" is uncertain. A development from **qumāš* (BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 135cβ; cf. BAUER-LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, § 61gy), however, is ruled out (see above, n. 9).

⁽¹²⁾ On the latter, see Siegmund FRAENKEL, *Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen* (Leiden 1886) 142.

⁽¹³⁾ On the etymology, see Francis BROWN, S. R. DRIVER and C. A. BRIGGS, *A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (Oxford 1972) 941b. It is possible that *u* in the Aram. (> Arab.) words results from labial assimilation, **im* > *um* (R. MACUCH, *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic* [Berlin 1965] § 72a).

vowel sequence $*u \dots *u/\bar{a}$, or in terms of their BH outcomes, $*u \dots \bar{o}$. When this vowel sequence occurs in forms with an open pretonic syllable, $*u > \bar{o}$. So, for example, $*bur\bar{a}\bar{s} > *bur\bar{o}\bar{s} > b\bar{e}r\bar{o}\bar{s}$ "juniper", or $*zunuwt > *zan\bar{u}t > z\bar{e}n\bar{u}t \rightarrow z\bar{e}n\bar{u}t$ "fornication⁽¹⁴⁾". When applied to closed syllables, this sound change would suggest that $*šuppur > *šəppur$ ⁽¹⁵⁾.

A shewa in a closed syllable, however, is always replaced by a full vowel⁽¹⁶⁾. Among the various replacements, one is directly applicable to $*šəppur$; that is, non-final $*C\bar{e}C(\bar{e}) > CiC(\bar{e})$, whether the second shewa is silent or vocal. Thus, $*b\bar{e}n+k\bar{a}$ ⁽¹⁷⁾ $> bink\bar{e}$ "your son" (see also $bin+PN$)⁽¹⁸⁾, and $*š\bar{e}m+k\bar{a} > šimk\bar{e}$ "your name". When the second shewa is vocal, the identical sound change occurs, as in $*b\bar{e}+p\bar{e}r\bar{i} > *bip\bar{e}r\bar{i} > bipr\bar{i}$ "in (the) fruit" (Deut 28,11; 30,9), or $*l\bar{e}+š\bar{e}m\bar{u}'\bar{e}l > lišm\bar{u}'\bar{e}l$ "to Samuel" (1 Sam 3,9; 15,11.12)⁽¹⁹⁾. The application of these phonological changes to $*šuppur$ etc. produces the following derivation:

$*šuppur$	$*yull\bar{a}d$
	$*yull\bar{o}d$ ($*\bar{a} : \bar{o}$)
$*šəppur$ (reduction of $*u + u$)	$*y\bar{e}ll\bar{o}d$ (reduction of $*u + \bar{o}$)
$*šippur$ (shewa $> i$)	$*yill\bar{o}d$ (shewa $> i$)
$šipp\bar{o}r$ (other, minor rules) ⁽²⁰⁾	$yill\bar{o}d$.

This reduction of $*u > \bar{e}$ also occurs when a non- u (-grade) vowel follows u . For example, BH *kissē* "throne" $< *kussi$ ⁽²¹⁾ also shows the replacement $*u (> *e) > i$ as in $*šuppur > šipp\bar{o}r$, with the exception that in *kissē*, $*u > i$ before an i -grade vowel. Yet environmental $*i/\bar{e}$ and $*u/\bar{o}$ form a natural class, since they are all high vowels⁽²²⁾. Thus if $*kussi > *k\bar{e}ssi > *kissi \rightarrow kiss\bar{e}$ "throne", $*u > \bar{e}$ before any high vowel⁽²³⁾.

But u is not always reduced before a high vowel. For example, in *gun-nōb* "to be kidnaped" (Gen 40,15), *hōhtēl* "to be swaddled" (Ezek 16,4), *hōmleah* "to be rubbed with salt" (Ezek 16,4), and *huggēd* "to be told" (Josh 9,24; Ru 2,11), u remains stable⁽²⁴⁾. Yet these examples differ from *šipp\bar{o}r*

⁽¹⁴⁾ On the latter, see BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 122c.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. JOÜON, *Grammaire*, § 30c.

⁽¹⁶⁾ R. HETZRON, "Third person singular pronoun suffixes in Proto-Semitic", *Orientalia Suecana* 18 (1969) 121-122.

⁽¹⁷⁾ The root of BH *bēn* "son" and *šēm* "name" lacks a stem vowel (A. GOETZE, "Accent and Vocalism in Hebrew", *JAOS* 59 [1939] 444 n. 36).

⁽¹⁸⁾ See M. LAMBERT, *Traité de grammaire hébraïque* (Paris 1946) 57 n. 1.

⁽¹⁹⁾ A similar phenomenon appears when the sequence $*h\bar{a}t\bar{e}ph$ vowel + shewa $>$ full vowel + shewa (e.g. GKC §§ 28a-b, 102d).

⁽²⁰⁾ *ērōm* "naked," however, is probably a $*qittul$ formation (KÖNIG, *Lehrge-bäude* II/1 § 63.1; and HALAT, 778b; cf. LAMBERT, *Traité*, § 421).

⁽²¹⁾ Cf. KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 463.

⁽²²⁾ W. R. GARR, "Pretonic Vowels in Hebrew", (forthcoming).

⁽²³⁾ See also the merger of $*qittul$ and $*qittul > qittul$, and of $*qittal$ and $*qittal > qittol$ (BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung*, §§ 44c, 134b). Cf. JOÜON, *Grammaire*, § 88Ie (on which see n. 9 above).

⁽²⁴⁾ BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung*, xxix n. 1; and GKB I § 27b. Cf. BROCKEL-

and *yillōd* because the latter are nouns, whereas *gunnōb* and the like are verbs⁽²⁵⁾. The reduction of *u* before another high vowel is thus restricted to nouns⁽²⁶⁾.

MANN, *Grundriss* I § 131c1; and KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 455. See also 'unnōtō "his humbling himself" in Ps 132,1.

⁽²⁵⁾ See already Hubert GRIMME, *Grundzüge der hebräischen Akzent- und Vokallehre* (Freiburg 1896) 38; and LAMBERT, *Traité*, § 128.

hittūk "melting" (Ezek 22,22), then, is probably not a *hophal* infinitive **hut-tūk* > *hittūk* (cf. BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung*, xxx, § 102d; and GKB I § 27b) but a noun. Perhaps this form is related to the **qittūl* nominal derivative of the *piel*, on which see KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 455.

⁽²⁶⁾ Including suffixed verbs, as e.g. *yəkol-tīw* "I have overcome him" (Ps 13,5), although these forms have an overall nominal valence (BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 43po; and MALONE, "Phonological Evidence for Syntactic Bracketing: A Surprise from Tiberian Hebrew", *Papers from the Twelfth Regional Meeting, Chicago Linguistic Society*... 1976 [ed. S. S. WUFWENE et al.] [Chicago 1976] 490).

Fem. sing. and masc. pl. suffixed *qal* imperatives, however, show the change **qutlī/ū* > *qitlī/ū*, i.e. **u* > *i* before *i/ū* (see KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 464-465; MALONE, in *Papers from the...* CLS, 490; and IDEM, "Textually Deviant Forms as Evidence for Phonological Analysis: A Service of Philology to Linguistics", *JANESCU* 11 [1979] 76). Since the sing. and pl. suffixed *qal* imperatives are formed from the same base, as e.g. *šəməʿ-ēnī* "hear me" (Gen 23,11.13.15) and *šəməʿ-ūnī* "hear me" (Gen 23,8, etc.) < **šəmaʿ*, so too 'əbdēhū "serve Him" (1 Chr 28,9) and 'ibdūhū "serve Him" (1 Sam 7,3) must be derived from the same *'əbud; on **qutl* < **qətul* in these forms, see Friedrich BÖTTCHER, *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Leipzig 1866-1868) § 363.Ab; and OLSHAUSEN, *Lehrbuch*, § 19b. In the fem. sing. and masc. pl. imperatives, then, sound change has created a new form *qitlī/ū* < **qutlī/ū*. Yet this sound change is restricted to these fem. sing. and masc. pl. forms; other cases of **qutl* + high vowel do not exhibit this change, as in *zəkrēnī* "remember me" (Judg 16,28; Jer 15,15; Ps 106,4) < **zəkurinī* and *ʔəmnēhū* "hide it" (Jer 13,4) < **ʔəmunihū* (see MALONE, in *Papers from the...* CLS, 493 n. 10). Rather than reflecting a general sound change, then, the *qal* imperative base **qitl* < **qutl* (< **qətul*) is, in all likelihood, morphologically restricted.

In non-suffixed *qal* imperatives, however, the forms *qitlī* and *qitlū* result from regular sound change accompanying the contextual accent shift. So, for example, *zīkrū* "remember" can be traced from:

* <i>zəkūrū</i>	(accent assignment)
<i>zəkōrū</i>	(pausal vowel lengthening) (Neh 4,8)
* <i>zəkurū</i>	(contextual accent shift)
* <i>zəkərū</i>	(mandatory reduction of CV > Cə in the contextually pretonic syllable [see GARR, (n. 22 above)])
* <i>zīkərū</i>	(shewa > <i>i</i> replacement [see n. 14])
<i>zīkrū</i>	(shewa deletion).

This development appears also in imperatives of *a*-stems:

<i>šəməʿ-ī</i>	"hear" (Isa 6,9)	<i>šəməʿ-ū</i>	"hear"
* <i>šəmaʿ-ī</i>	(contextual accent shift)	* <i>šəmaʿ-ū</i>	
* <i>šəmaʿ-ī</i>	(reduction)	* <i>šəmaʿ-ū</i>	
* <i>šiməʿ-ī</i>	(shewa > <i>i</i>)	* <i>šiməʿ-ū</i>	
<i>šim-ī</i>	(shewa deletion)	<i>šim-ū</i>	

The *i*-vowel in *zīkrī/zīkrū*, then, did not develop from **u* (cf. MALONE, in *Papers from the...* CLS, 490; and IDEM, *JANESCU* 11 [1979] 76) but from **CəCə* > *CiC* (EWALD, *Lehrbuch* [Göttingen 1870] § 226d). The occasional ap-

Another exception to this rule of reduction occurs in reduplicated and suffixed forms. In reduplicated nouns, **u* is not reduced before another high vowel, as for example **qudqud* > *qodqod* "head" and **gulgult* > *gulgolet* "skull"⁽²⁷⁾. So too, **u* is not reduced when the following high vowel is a suffixed element. Thus, **ʕznō* "his ear" and **gobhō* "his height" exhibit unchanged **u*. In both reduplicated and suffixed forms, however, **u* fails to change under the identical condition: **u* is not reduced when **u* and the following high vowel are not in the same segment⁽²⁸⁾. Since reduplicated forms are compound (**qud*+*qud*), and suffixed forms consist of base+suffix (**ʕzn*+*ō*), the morphemic boundary in both forms blocks the reduction of **u*. This reduction is therefore only segment-internal⁽²⁹⁾.

In view of this restriction, it is unlikely that **imrō* "his word" (cf. **omer* < **umr*), **bisrō* "his ripening grapes" (cf. **bosēr* < **busr*), and **nikhō/ī* "in front of him/me" (cf. **nokaḥ* < **nukḥ*) reflect the same sound changes as **suppur* > *šippōr*⁽³⁰⁾. Rather, they are **qitl* nouns alternating with parallel **qutl* forms, an alternation found sporadically throughout the Semitic languages⁽³¹⁾. They do not violate the rule that **u*+high vowel is not reduced between segments.

**kuttonet* "tunic" is the only exception to this rule of vowel reduction. Yet in view of its distribution among Semitic and non-Semitic languages alike⁽³²⁾ and its odd inflexion within Hebrew (abs. *kuttonet*⁽³³⁾, cstr. *kətonet*,

pearance, however, of *ʕ* in these forms (e.g. **ʕlzi* "rejoice" [Zeph 3,14], *qorḥi* "make yourself bald" [Mic 1,16], etc.) is attributable to the assimilation of initial shewa to the preceding back or low consonant (see MALONE, *JANESCU* 11 [1979] 76), as in *ḥšršbī* "be dry" (Isa 44,27) < **ḥəršbī*. As in *zəkrēnī* < **zəkurinī*, the initial vowel in *ḥšršbī* is a reflex of shewa, not an original **u*.

⁽²⁷⁾ KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 455.

⁽²⁸⁾ "Segment" here denotes the smallest morphemic unit between two contiguous boundaries.

⁽²⁹⁾ *Yēšua'* < **Yahu*+*šū'* (> *Yəhōšua'*) would appear to violate this restriction. Yet this late form of the name is phonologically suspect and may be dialectal (OLSHAUSEN, *Lehrbuch*, § 277e; E. NESTLE, "Josua – Jesus", *TSK* 65 [1892] 573-574; and S. E. LOEWENSTAMM, "Yēšua'", *Encyclopaedia Biblica* III [Jerusalem 1958] 895 [in Hebrew]). See also S. MORAG, "Mēša'", *A Study of Certain Features of Old Hebrew Dialects*, *Eretz Israel* 5 [1958] 143 with n. 44 [in Hebrew]. Further, the vocalization of יהוה as *Yēhū'* < **Yahu+a'* (see נעלא in the Samaria ostraca) is probably patterned after *Yēšua'* (Jeffrey TIGAY [private communication]).

⁽³⁰⁾ Cf., e.g., BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 94r; GKC § 27w; BAUER – LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, § 21k; and KUTSCHER, *Isaiah*, 54, 452, 455, 457-460.

⁽³¹⁾ BARTH, "Vergleichende Studien", *ZDMG* 43 (1889) 183 n. 1; William WRIGHT, *Lectures on the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Cambridge 1890) 81; and BROCKELMANN, "Neuere Theorien zur Geschichte des Akzents und des Vokalismus im Hebräischen und Aramäischen", *ZDMG* 94 (1940) 342. Similarly, J. FRIEDRICH, "Semitische Kleinigkeiten", *Homages à André Dupont-Sommer* (Paris 1971) 196; and W. EILERS, "Zur Funktion von Nominalformen", *WO* 3 (1964) 90.

⁽³²⁾ KUTSCHER, *Words*, 97-101, esp. pp. 100-101. Cf. BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 94r.

⁽³³⁾ See also the alternate abs. sing. *kətonet*.

suffixed *kuttōntō*), this aberrant form is probably a *Kulturwort*⁽³⁴⁾. It does not contradict the phonological rules already adduced: in nouns, segment-internal *u + high vowel is reduced to shewa; otherwise, reduction is blocked.

*The dissimilation of *ô/*û.* Several forms have been adduced as examples of the dissimilation of *ô or *û:

*rô' šōn (*rô' š + ān)	→	BH ri' šōn "first"
*tôkōn (*tôk + ān)	→	tīkōn "middle"
*hūšōn (*hūš + ān)	→	hīšōn "external"
*lūlō' (*lū + lā)	→	lūlē(') "if not".

The appearance of other forms which do not undergo this dissimilation⁽³⁵⁾, however, weakens the rule considerably. Further, *u + high vowel is stalled when the following high vowel lies on the other side of a morphemic boundary. In the present examples, though, dissimilation is said to cross the boundary, i.e. +ōn and +lō' ⁽³⁶⁾.

The first three words — ri' šōn, tīkōn, and hīšōn — are morphologically similar, since they consist of base + ōn suffix. In Hebrew, as in Aramaic dialects, the nominal/adjectival ending *-ān (> BH -ōn) may be suffixed to monosyllabic bases, as for example 'aḥārōn "last" and qadmōn "eastern"⁽³⁷⁾. In weak roots⁽³⁸⁾, nouns and adjectives generally assume the form *qitlān (BH qitlōn)⁽³⁹⁾, as for example qīšōn⁽⁴⁰⁾ "outermost" and 'ēlyōn "supreme"; see also ḥēbyōn "hiding". Instead of reflecting vowel dissimilation, these words represent *qitlān formations⁽⁴¹⁾. Each is a *qitlān adjectival form of a monosyllabic weak root.

While the development of hīšōn "external" < *hiyšōn (cf. ḥayīš "wall") is regular, tīkōn and ri' šōn require explanation. In ri' šōn "first", *i has not assimilated to the *aleph*, contrary to expected BH phonological rules. Normally, *Ci' > Cē' in unaccented syllables; the *aleph* then quiesces and ē is lengthened (and raised) to ē⁽⁴²⁾ (e.g. *ri' šīt > *rē' šīt > rē' šīt "beginning").

⁽³⁴⁾ See also *kussemēt* "spelt", if it is derived from *kussimī (note the plural). Yet cf. BAUER – LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, § 61y''.

⁽³⁵⁾ See above.

⁽³⁶⁾ E.g. EWALD, *Lehrbuch*⁸, § 163c; and BEYER, *Grammatik*, 52, 55.

⁽³⁷⁾ BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 215c; and JOÜON, *Grammaire*, § 88Me. See also BARTH, *Die Nominalbildung*, § 207a.

⁽³⁸⁾ *qitlān formations appear with strong roots too, as e.g. ḥesrōn "deficiency", ḥesbōn "account", yitrōn "advantage", kišrōn "skill", and šilōn "mastery"; all these nouns are late, and some may be loanwords (see Theodor NÖLDEKE, "[Review of KAUTZSCH, *Die Aramaismen*]", *ZDMG* 57 [1903] 417-418). The derivation of these nouns from *qutlān formations (see, e.g., BAUER – LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, §§ 61mθ-nθ) is ruled out by the morphemic boundary *qutl + ān/*qutl + ōn.

⁽³⁹⁾ BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 212Ac. For a list of words with this form, see KÖNIG, *Lehrgebäude* II/1 § 77.2.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Cf. GKB I § 24a (pp. 140-141).

⁽⁴¹⁾ LAMBERT, *Traité*, 55 n. 3.

⁽⁴²⁾ GKB I § 15d; and BAUER – LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, §§ 25b, d.

The form of the numeral *ri'šōn*, however, is old⁽⁴³⁾ and preserves a stage of development *before* assimilation and quiescence took place⁽⁴⁴⁾.

tikōn developed differently, although it conformed to regular BH sound changes. The proto-form of *tikōn* is **tiwkān*, a **qitlān* formation of **twk*. In non-final position, however, **iwC > iyC* (→ **iC*)⁽⁴⁵⁾, as in certain *ʾw* verb forms (**yiwraš > *yiyrāš* → *yīraš* "he will inherit", etc.)⁽⁴⁶⁾. Thus **tiwkān* can have developed as **tiwkān/*tiwkōn > *tiykōn > *tīkōn* → *tikōn*.

If *ḥiṣōn*, *ri'šōn*, and *tikōn* do not support Geiger's hypothesis of vowel dissimilation, only⁽⁴⁷⁾ *lūlē'* "if not" remains. Yet in addition to the several counterexamples to this rule, vowel reduction is blocked by a morphemic boundary. *A priori*, then, *lūlē'* is not certain evidence of vowel dissimilation.

The only support for the derivation of *lūlē'* < **lū+lō'* are the cognate forms in Arabic and Akkadian, where the second element is *lā* (> BH *lō'*). If vowel dissimilation is discounted, the final vowel of *lūlē'* must have developed from another source. Olshausen⁽⁴⁸⁾ suggested a derivation from **lū + *lay*, although no negative particle **lay* exists in the related languages. More plausibly, Rosenthal⁽⁴⁹⁾ suggests that *lūlē'* resulted from the conflation of **lūlā* and **lū'ay*; the precative particle was fused to the negation **lā* (common Semitic, except Eth.) and **'ay* (Akkadian prohibitive particle *ay/ē*;

⁽⁴³⁾ See also MEYER, *Grammatik* I § 27.3; and FRIEDRICH, *Hommages*, 195. The Ugaritic name *Riśn* (CTA 93,9), however, is not necessarily comparable to BH *ri'šōn*. If the *aleph* in *Riśn* is syllable-closing, the preceding vowel may be *i*, *a*, or even *u* (D. MARCUS, "The Three Alephs in Ugaritic", *JANESCU* 1 [1968] 52 with n. 12). Its exact vocalization is therefore uncertain.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ For similar fluctuations between *i/ē* in the presence of gutturals, see GRIMME, *Grundzüge*, 96 with n. 2; NÖLDEKE, "Inkonsequenzen in der hebräischen Punktation", *ZA* 26 (1912) 1, 7; GKB I § 280; and BAUER – LEANDER, *Historische Grammatik*, § 18m.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ See, provisionally, GKB I § 17f. Cf. BLAU, "Marginalia Semitica I", *Israel Oriental Studies* 1 (1971) 3-4 with n. 13.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ H. BIRKELAND, *Akzent und Vokalismus im Althebräischen* (Oslo 1940) 95.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ The thematic vowel of *yō'hez* "he seizes", etc. does not result from dissimilation (cf. PHILIPPI, "[Review of LAND, *Grammar* and BICKELL, *Grammar*]", *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 10 [1878] 270 n. **; IDEM, *Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie und Sprachwissenschaft* 14 [1883] 178; BROCKELMANN, *Grundriss* I § 266Ad; GKC § 68c n. 2; JOÜON, *Grammaire*, § 73c; and MEYER, *Grammatik* II [Berlin 1969] § 77.1a). Rather, they reflect old *i*-imperfect formations (e.g. NÖLDEKE, "[Review of TEGNÉR, *W*]", *ZDMG* 25 [1871] 667; LAMBERT, "Le futur *qal* des verbes à première radicale *vav*, *noun* ou *alef*", *REJ* 27 [1893] 140 with nn. 2, 3; and BARTH, *ZDMG* 43 [1889] 189-190).

For the alleged dissimilation in *'šnōkī* "I" (D. SIVAN, *Grammatical Analysis and Glossary of the Northwest Semitic Vocables in Akkadian Texts of the 15th-13th C.B.C. from Canaan and Syria* [Kevelaer/Neukirchen-Vluyn 1984] 24), see GARR, *Dialect Geography of Syria-palestine, 1000-586 B.C.E.* (Philadelphia 1985), chapter 2, no. 5.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ OLSHAUSEN, *Lehrbuch*, § 224c.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ FRANZ ROSENTHAL, (private communication).

see also Eth. 'i)⁽⁵⁰⁾. This alternate derivation of *lūlē'*, then obviates the need to resort to vowel dissimilation to explain final *-ē*.

An examination of the examples adduced in support of a rule of vowel dissimilation in Hebrew has shown that this phonological rule has no foundation. Alleged examples of this dissimilation can be matched with a number of counterexamples. Words which purport to demonstrate the dissimilation of short **u* can be subsumed under another phonological rule, that of the reduction of segment-internal, nominal **u* followed by a high vowel (and its later replacement by *i*). Or, as in the case of *'imrō*, they are **qitl* nouns with parallel **qutl* formations. The examples of the dissimilation of **ô/û* have been explained as **qitlān* adjectival formations and represent a specific morphological class, not the implementation of a phonological rule. In the case of *lūlē'*, an alternative derivation frustrates the appeal to vowel dissimilation. Thus, there is no Biblical Hebrew rule of vowel dissimilation **u > i* or **ô/û > i/ē*.

Department of Oriental Studies
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, PA 19104
U.S.A.

W. Randall GARR

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Parenthetically, ROSENTHAL (ibid.) suggests that the prohibitive particle *'al* may derive from **'ay* + **l(i/û)*, and that *lō'* may be a compound of adversative *l-* + negation (on the latter, see LAMBERT, *Traité*, 18 n. 1, for the form).

Ein übersehenes Fragment Aquilas in Jr 38(31),22b?

Ziegler verzeichnet für Jr 38(31),22b ὅτι ἔκτισε – fin... folgendes Fragment Aquilas: ὅτι ἔκτισε κύριος καινὸν ἐν τῇ γῇ· θήλεια [ἐν τῇ σωτηρίᾳ] περικυκλώσει ἄνδρα, was genau dem TM entspricht. Ausserdem bringt Ziegler ein weiteres, kürzeres und ein wenig verschiedenes Fragment desselben Übersetzers und führt als Bezeugung auch PsTheodotus^{1st} an (PG 77,1429D); es lautet: ὅτι ἔκτισε κύριος καινὸν ἐν τῇ θηλείᾳ = “Creavit Dominus novum in femina”.

Aber damit ist das Fragment Aquilas noch nicht zu Ende, denn Theodotus von Ancyra fährt fort: ἡ δὲ κτισθεῖσα εἰς καταφύτευμα σωτηρίας, καινὴ καὶ οὐ παλαιά. Καὶ ταῦτα μὲν Ἀκύλας. Darauf führt er den Text der Septuaginta an. Man findet dieses Fragment im griechischen Original bei M. Jugie⁽¹⁾. Es besteht somit kein Zweifel, dass Theodotus ein längeres Fragment Aquilas zu Jr 38(31),22b bezeugt, das Erwähnung verdient hätte.

So viel ich sehe, wurde das Fragment auch sonst nicht bemerkt, denn ich finde es weder bei Schleusner und in der Konkordanz von Hatch-Redpath noch auch im neuen Aquila-Index von Reider-Turner⁽²⁾. Besonders auffällig ist, dass Ziegler den ersten Teil auch aus PsTheodotus^{1st} (PG 77,1429D) anführt, aber das Folgende, eben unser neues Fragment, ganz auslässt, obwohl es im lateinischen Text mit allen Buchstaben geboten wird: “Creavit Dominus novum in femina (s. oben); *haec autem creata est in plantationem salutis novae et non veteris*”. Atque haec quidem Aquila (PG 77,1429D).

Der einzige Unterschied ist *novae*/καινή und *veteris*/παλαιά. Der lateinische Text stammt vom gelehrten Dominikaner Fr. Combefis (1605-1679)⁽³⁾. Den griechischen Urtext fand er höchstwahrscheinlich im Kodex 1175 des fonds grec der Bibliothèque Nationale von Paris aus dem zehnten Jahrhundert, veröffentlichte ihn aber nicht, wohl wegen der schauderbaren Orthographie des Kodex⁽⁴⁾.

(1) “Homélies Mariales Byzantines...: Theodoti Episcopi Ancyrae Oratio in Sanctam Mariam Dei Genitricem et in Sanctam Christi Nativitatem”, in R. GRAFFIN – F. NAU, *Patrologia Orientalis* Tomus Decimus Nonus (Paris 1926) 318-335. Den Text Aquilas und der Septuaginta findet man § 14, auf S. 333, 14-21.

(2) J. REIDER – N. TURNER, *An Index to Aquila* (VTS 12; Leiden 1966).

(3) *Bibliotheca Patrum concionatoria* (Paris 1662) I, 199-204.

(4) JUGIE, “Homélies Mariales”, 290-291. Jugie bietet im allgemeinen den lateinischen Text des Combefis, verbessert ihn aber einigemal, so z.B. in unserem Fragment: *nova et non vetus* für das *novae, et non veteris* des Combefis.

Wirklich ein Fragment Aquilas?

Aber die grosse Frage ist eben: stammt dieses übersehene Fragment wirklich von Aquila? Theodotus von Ancyra war sicher kein unbekannter Ignorant, denn neben Cyrillus von Alexandrien war er die Hauptfigur auf dem Konzil von Ephesus (431), und da er sich gegen die Juden auf diese Übersetzung ihres Landsmanns beruft, wird er sich der Genauigkeit seiner Zitierung beflissen haben. Andererseits weicht der von ihm gebotene Text des Aquila doch wohl zuviel vom TM ab und bekundet unübersehbare Ähnlichkeiten mit der LXX: καταφύτευμα (was auch sonst als Variante in der griechischen Textüberlieferung erscheint), σωτηρία und καινή. Aber diese Echtheitsfrage überlasse ich einer berufeneren Feder.

Verbesserung des ersten textkritischen Apparats

Der von Jugie zum erstenmal herausgegebene Urtext der Homilie des Theodotus verlangt auch eine Richtigstellung im ersten textkritischen Apparat Zieglers, nämlich: ἔκτισε κύριος σωτηρίαν εἰς καταφύτευσιν καινήν Zi.] Κύριος ἔκτισεν εἰς καταφύτευμα σωτηρίαν καινήν Theodotus: also Umstellung von ἔκτισε κύριος/Κύριος ἔκτισεν und von σωτηρίαν εἰς καταφύτευσιν/ εἰς καταφύτευμα σωτηρίαν; sodann καταφύτευμα für – φύτευσιν. Das Schlusswort ἐν ᾗ σωτηρία περιελεύσονται ἄνθρωποι der LXX stimmt vollkommen mit dem Text des Theodotus überein und könnte als weiterer Testzeuge angeführt werden.

Was die Bezeichnung "PsTheodotus" bei Ziegler betrifft, so bestehen nach Jugie keine stichhaltigen Gründe gegen die Echtheit dieser Homilie des Theodotus von Ancyra⁽⁵⁾.

Colégio Cristo Rei
C.P. 416
93000 São Leopoldo RS
Brasil

J. Balduino KIPPER, S. J.

(5) "Homélie Mariales", 292-293.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

L. ALONSO SCHÖKEL, J. VILCHEZ LINDEZ, A. PINTO, *Proverbios* (Nueva Biblia Española: Sapienciales I). 606 p. Madrid 1984. Ediciones Cristiandad.

The New Spanish Bible (1975) was first issued in fascicles, in the style of *La Sainte Bible* (of Jerusalem). A translation of Proverbs with rather generous notes came from professor Alonso Schökel in 1968. It turns out to be the harbinger of the new and full commentary under review. A spot check indicates that the 1975 translation of the text (slightly revised from 1968) is the basis for the commentary. In addition, J. Vilchez Lindez has provided a survey of modern scholarly research in the area of Hebrew wisdom, as well as an introduction to the book of Proverbs. A. Pinto has supplied three indices: Hebrew words (those most frequently used in the biblical book), a list of Spanish terms, and an elaborate topical (*índice ideológico*) index. Alonso Schökel is responsible for an introductory essay about wisdom literature, a brief treatment of the literary and stylistic characteristics of the genres employed in the book of Proverbs, and the commentary itself.

In general the commentary follows the format of Alonso Schökel's full commentaries on Job (1983; reviewed in *Bib* 65 [1984] 589-590) and Prophets (1980) in the same series. Textual problems are not discussed in great depth, but care is taken to indicate the basis of a reading. These observations, along with grammatical and stylistic analysis, flow with the explanation of the text. Considerable effort has been expended in underscoring catchwords, alliteration and assonance, and other stylistic features of the *mēšālīm*.

The allocation of the introductory questions and the bibliography to Vilchez Lindez and the commentary to Alonso Schökel has left some gaps. For example, the commentary recognizes seven collections in Proverbs, and structures the book accordingly. Vilchez Lindez expresses a preference for nine (p. 99: four collections in chaps. 30-31). Vilchez Lindez offers a discussion of modern views concerning the dating of the collections, and seems to agree with a general opinion that 1-9 and 31,10-31 were composed by the same hand, that of the final editor, in the postexilic period. The Solomonic collections, which may have been formed gradually, certainly reach back into the postexilic period. The commentary does not take a position. While the bibliography refers to special studies, commentaries, and articles, the commentary shows little trace of dialogue with the scholarly literature. Only infrequently are modern scholars (Delitzsch, Boström) indicated. The works

of Maldonado and R. Baynus seem to receive most attention. But the fact remains that Alonso Schökel's comments are quite original and insightful, marked by a balanced judgment.

The striking frequency of the warning against adultery has always been a puzzling aspect of Prov 1-9. Alonso Schökel claims that the adulteress is not only real, but also symbolic as a counterpart to Lady Wisdom (pp. 201-202); however, the point is not developed. He suggests that in 5,3-10 the *zārāh* is in a relationship with a cruel man (*'akzārī*, 5,9), and both victimize the innocent youth. In chapters 5-8 he finds a succession of women: the harlot (*la ramera*; 5,3-14.20-23); the adulteress (6,20-35); the seduction scene of 7,1-27 (Boström's thesis about a ritual prostitute is "hard to prove"), and finally Lady Wisdom, who is the antithesis (p. 230) of the woman of chap. 7. Lady Wisdom, a personification and not a person, is an artisan (8,30) rather than a child, and also mediates life (8,35). She reappears in 9,1-6 as the opposite number to Dame Folly. The *'iššāh zārāh* "has grown so far as to become an exemplary figure, greater than an anonymous prostitute" (p. 247). One would like to know more about the implications of these symbols, but perhaps one must simply admit that the text does not allow one to go further than this. As the commentator remarks concerning Prov 25,17, it may be the case that the interpreter must be humble, and "not eat too much honey".

Recent research (Hermisson, Plöger) has tended to find a context for the interpretation of chaps. 10ff. The issue is not simply that the Solomonic collections are not haphazard. The use of themes, catchwords and repetitions proves that. Rather, is there an overarching and unifying perspective, a hermeneutical context, within a group of sayings? It is difficult to prove this, despite the efforts of O. Plöger in his recent commentary. Alonso Schökel stops short of claiming a "context", but his stylistic analysis is exceedingly rich in observations that point in this direction. Thus, *bēn* and *mūsār* in 13,1.24 "invites one to think of an inclusion" (p. 299). On the other hand, the repetitions in 25,2.27, while noted, do not merit such a suggestion. A unified reading of 25,1-20 is supported by his literary analysis. This is perhaps the primary strength of the commentary: nowhere else will one find a stylistic analysis of Proverbs in such depth as here. Another example of the discovery of fine literary touches is in the treatment of chaps. 30-31. All would doubtless agree with the assessment that from a literary point of view one page in chaps. 25-29 is worth ten in the preceding Solomonic collection (p. 447).

This volume will take a rightful place among the standard commentaries on Proverbs. It is written with a certain verve and suggests new ways of dealing with the biblical text. It is—of all things—an exciting and original commentary.

The Divinity School
Duke University
Durham, NC 27706
U.S.A.

Roland E. MURPHY, O. Carm.

A. VAN SELMS, *Job I* (De Prediking van het Oude Testament). 206 p. Nijkerk 1982. G. F. Callenbach.

The aims and procedures of this valuable series of commentaries are well-known; Professor van Selms' first volume on Job, covering chs. 1-21, is a welcome and worthy addition. The author bravely dispenses with an introduction (apart from three brief pages on the poetic books, especially the wisdom literature), and plunges straight into commentary. The bulk of his volume is verse by verse commentary of a chiefly philological kind, exegetical in the narrower sense of comment upon words and phrases. Given the nature of the series there is no engagement (except in the occasional endnotes) with other commentators or with current lexical proposals. The commentary on each of the book's speeches is followed by a "literary analysis", in which are noted revocalizations or emendations adopted, metrical observations, and form-critical issues. The last element is a reflection, usually of a page or more, on preaching from the speech in question.

It is a particular quality of these homiletic reflections that the author attempts a positive theological evaluation of the utterances of all the participants in the dialogue, inadequate, one-sided and downright wrong though they may often be. It is an unhappy fact that the more one concentrates on the subtle and adventurous theological position of the book as a whole, the more one is tempted to disparage the myopic vision of its characters (not excluding Job himself); van Selms is, interestingly, more in sympathy with the medieval gleaning of "moralia" from the book, though to some extent that means shutting out the subversive programme of a book that puts all the best theology in the mouth of those who are divinely adjudged not to have spoken of God what is right (42,8). In reference to Zophar's speech in ch. 11, for example, the author's principal concern is to affirm the truth of Zophar's doctrine of prayer: only the prayer of a righteous man is heeded — and the prayer of a righteous man is effectual. Though van Selms can call to Zophar's support Jas 5,16 and Hab 11,6, it ought to be evident that the text of Job is more penetrating and radical than either of those two New Testament texts. For from the perspective of the book as a whole there is no question that Job is a righteous man *and* that his prayer is not needed — not for some time, at any rate, and not in the sense it was intended. That uncomfortable truth is perhaps even more preachable than the blander truths of conventional dogma. It may indeed be suggested that a more systematically theological commentary, in which each verse was weighed not for the exact meaning of the Hebrew but for its religious, psychological, and pastoral worth, may have been even truer to the intentions of the series.

The University of Sheffield
Sheffield S10 2TN
England

D. J. A. CLINES

Odo CAMPONOV, *Königtum, Königsherrschaft und Reich Gottes in den Frühjüdischen Schriften*. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis, 58. XIV-492 p. Freiburg CH - Göttingen 1984. Universitätsverlag - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. sFr. 98, -

Cosa intendeva dire Gesù quando annunciava il Regno di Dio o il Regno dei Cieli? Alla risposta a questo quesito, centrale per la comprensione del Nuovo Testamento, cerca di rispondere, e con notevole successo, quest'importante tesi di laurea discussa presso l'università di Friburgo nella Svizzera.

L'opera si divide nelle seguenti parti: una prima ci offre una storia delle ricerche fino ai nostri giorni, seguita da un esame del concetto nell'Antico Testamento; una seconda esamina la letteratura intertestamentaria (p. 4s., termine che l'autore considera giustamente poco esatto, ma che è tanto comodo, se usato convenzionalmente!) anteriore all'epoca dei Maccabei, una terza s'occupa della letteratura seguita alla crisi della rivolta; una quarta parte del concetto nella letteratura giudaico-ellenistica della diaspora, includendo in questa anche le traduzioni greche, specialmente quella dei LXX ed i *targummîm*, concludendo poi con un bilancio finale. In tutto l'opera costituisce un prontuario insostituibile sull'argomento, un'antologia completa dei testi che riguardano il nostro tema.

Le conclusioni sono quanto mai interessanti e confermano quanto era in parte già noto. Solo nel libro di Daniele, il Regno occupa un posto centrale. Nelle altre opere, di qualsiasi tipo siano, si tratta di un concetto marginale. Difficile è stabilire che cosa i vari autori abbiano voluto dire con esattezza: se parlano per es. della sovranità presente ed universale di Dio, ovvero se intendano quella escatologica (l'ebraico e l'aramaico *malkût* può indicare ambedue i concetti). Per spiegare questa imprecisione (per noi, naturalmente, per il nostro pensiero occidentale, così abituato a pensare in categorie esclusive) l'autore segue lo studio di N. Perrin del 1976, il quale attribuisce al concetto un valore simbolico, che riecheggia una serie di miti e di tradizioni (p. 437 ss.). E tale simbolo appare essere stato particolarmente attivo nella cerchia degli Asidei e dei loro seguaci più moderati, i Farisei (441 s.). In ogni caso, data la bivalenza del termine ebraico ed aramaico, *Basileia* nel Nuovo Testamento dovrà essere tradotto, a seconda del caso, con sovranità presente o con regno escatologico, tenendo presente che nei due casi abbiamo a che fare con un elemento fortemente dinamico; ciò viene confermato del resto dai testi del mondo circostante.

Alcune questioni di dettaglio. Quanto a p. 93 ss. l'autore traduce i Salmi *Jhwh malak* usando per la radice *špʾ* «giudicare» e pensando quindi al giudizio escatologico; una sua resa (ben conosciuta del resto, ma esclusa dall'autore) con «governare» avrebbe ribadito il concetto della sovranità presente, senza per altro escludere una reinterpretazione posteriore nel senso di «giudicare», interpretazione favorita del resto dal doppio significato della radice. A p. 401 la Geniza del Cairo è diventata «una» geniza. Poco male, certo.

Il testo è stato composto con una macchina da scrivere ed è particolarmente ben battuto, contrariamente a quanto avviene spesso in Europa in casi

come questo. Peccato che la macchina da scrivere usata non abbia avuto le dieresi per le maiuscole, il segno /β/, il circolo per certe parole scandinave: A. Hultgård appare così come Hultgard. Nella bibliografia ho trovato una sola mancanza: il lavoro di J. B. Segal, *Sefer Ben-Sirā' haššālēm* (Jerusalem 1958). Tutte queste sono piccolezze che nulla tolgono ad un lavoro diligente e preciso, che sarà certamente di notevole utilità a quanti vorranno studiare non solo il Nuovo Testamento, ma anche la letteratura intertestamentaria e lo stesso Antico Testamento.

Via Pietro Cossa, 42
00193 Roma

J. A. SOGGIN

Varia

James C. VANDERKAM, *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 16), x-217 p. Washington, D.C. 1984. The Catholic Biblical Association of America.

The meaning of Enoch and his work, as both are presented in the *earlier* Jewish literature dealing with them, is the subject of this study. The author proposes *divination* as one of the principal keys to be used in unlocking this meaning, and, in so doing, not only treats the reader to a fascinating analysis of the principal texts viewed in the light of this suggestion, but also succeeds in clarifying the meaning of "apocalyptic" itself.

In the introductory first chapter the author indicates how heavily he relies upon the opinion (developed especially by H.-P. Müller) that *all* apocalyptic finds its background in "mantic wisdom". The relation, therefore, of Enoch, a central figure in apocalyptic literature, to Enmeduranki, long known as, among other things, the founder of a priestly guild of diviners, marks the beginning of VdK's development of his principal theme. Less than adequate treatment given in past studies to these two venerable figures, as well as the publication of new materials not available heretofore, have necessitated, claims the author, the method employed in his book.

Next, our knowledge of Enmeduranki, drawn from available Mesopotamian sources, is put in order and related to the Enoch of Gen 5,21-24. But in this same Chapter Two, the "assumption" of Enoch, deriving as it may well do from the traditions regarding the fish-men (*Apkallū*), is also briefly dealt with. Chapter Three goes on to survey the subject of Mesopotamian divination in general, and to discuss how "mantic wisdom" influenced the development of Jewish apocalyptic even in face of the negative view of the diviner's art taken by the Old Testament.

The remainder of the study confines itself to examining what the author considers to be the earlier specimens of Enoch literature. Thus, neither the *Similitudes* (*1 Enoch* 37–71) nor *2 Enoch* enter into consideration.

In testing the hypothetical importance of Mesopotamian arts of divination regarding the development of the apocalyptic Enoch, VdK, starting with what to our knowledge is earliest, turns first to the Astronomical Book (*1 Enoch* 72–82) and the Book of Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1–36). In a summary judgment based on these two works and on Gen 5,21–24, VdK states (p. 141) that “the principal features of Enoch’s biography reflect, often in modified shape, those of Enmeduranki, and the media through which Enoch receives revelations and to some extent their contents as well echo those of the diviner”. But with regard to these two booklets themselves, though their earlier date, taken together with their obvious and pronounced interest in the phenomena of nature, points in the direction of VdK’s hypothesis, apocalyptic interests manifested (*1 Enoch* 80–81) in the Astronomical Book may well be secondary (pp. 106–109), and the eschatology of the Book of Watchers, while a prominent and important element thereof, does not, in VdK’s opinion, merit being called apocalyptic (pp. 119, 135, 140).

The analysis of the Book of Watchers shows how it represents a considerable advance in complexity over the simpler picture presented in the Astronomical Book; but it is only in the later booklets contained in *1 Enoch* that eschatology becomes the central issue and is more properly termed apocalyptic. The Apocalypse of Weeks (*1 Enoch* 93,1–10+91,11–17) and the Book of Dreams (*1 Enoch* 83–90) introduce the compartmentalized historical survey to Enoch’s revelations, while the Epistle of Enoch (*1 Enoch* 91–107, excepting the ApW) blends prophecy and wisdom into testamentary exhortations dominated by the great reversal which will follow the final judgment. Such development along clearly eschatological and, finally, apocalyptic lines means for VdK that “Enoch’s divinatory characteristics never faded from view but they did take on some new forms” (p. 189). The “oriental base” was built upon with materials drawn from both biblical and Hellenistic models.

Paralleling description of the larger successive developments manifest in the five works already mentioned are the summaries given of what if anything each one has to offer by way of a new or different image of Enoch himself. Notable among such is the picture afforded by *1 Enoch* 106–107 where what is said of Enoch may well be modeled on the ultimate fate of the Mesopotamian flood hero. This aspect of the book’s method is concluded in the beginning of the final summarizing chapter by a brief look at the short biography of Enoch contained in *Jubilees* 4,16–25. Here his life in Eden (after his final “assumption”) and his status of “culture hero” are brought forward as expansions of Gen 5 not attested to by *1 Enoch*.

If study of nature and predictions based on such study are the two fundamental aspects of the diviner’s art, then the earliest extended piece of Enoch literature, the Astronomical Book, goes but half way in establishing Enoch as diviner for it contains no predictions. Yet this general definition, as well as a quite specific likeness to Enmeduranki, emerge in Gen 5 and the earlier works examined. This study thus brings together most of the basic

material relevant to the study of what Enoch was and did, organizing it around the testing of an hypothesis which leads, in the end, to a clearer concept both of Enoch and the ever elusive "apocalyptic".

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome

Thomas FRANXMAN

Luis Díez MERINO, *Targum de Salmos*. Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora (Bibliotheca Hispana Biblica Vol. 6). 476 p. Madrid 1982; *Targum de Job*. Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora (Bibliotheca Hispana Biblica Vol. 8). 389 p. Madrid 1984; *Targum de Proverbios*. Edición Príncipe del Ms. Villa-Amil n. 5 de Alfonso de Zamora (Bibliotheca Hispana Biblica Vol. 11). 314 p. Madrid 1984.

La collection qui réunit ces ouvrages a pour but de publier les textes représentant la «Tradición sefardí de la Biblia aramea» (Targum des Prophètes et des Hagiographes). Le problème essentiel du Targum des Hagiographes est le manque presque total d'éditions critiques. On ne peut que saluer avec satisfaction tout effort tendant à remédier à cette situation. Les manuscrits ne manquent pas, où l'on peut distinguer deux traditions, yéménite et occidentale. Cf. L. Díez Merino, «La tradición yemení del Targum de Hagiógrafos», *EstBib* 42 (1984) 269-314 et notre recension de A. van der Heide (*The Yemenite Tradition of the Targum of Lamentations*, Leiden 1981) dans *Bib* 64 (1983) 276-279.

On connaissait le Tg des Hagiographes surtout par les Polyglottes d'Anvers (*Biblia Regia* 1571) et de Londres (B. Walton 1657). Mais quelque doute subsistait sur leur valeur en raison de différences laissant supposer retouches et manipulations (surtout des coupures). Díez Merino, neveu et disciple du regretté A. Díez Macho, a eu la bonne fortune de retrouver à Madrid (Biblioteca de San Bernardo) les mss (que l'on croyait perdus) préparés par le juif converti Alfonso de Zamora pour la première Polyglotte (*Biblia Polyglotta Complutensia*, achevée en 1517). Ils contiennent le Targum et une version latine, en colonnes parallèles. Cette Polyglotte ayant finalement imprimé seulement Onqelos, les mss de Zamora ne furent pas utilisés. En revanche, ils servirent pour celle d'Anvers, avec quelques modifications introduites par les éditeurs, surtout Arias Montano. Ces mss, nous dit-on, furent copiés sur des textes anciens et dignes de foi et l'on connaît la rigueur et la fidélité que le cardinal Cisneros exigeait de son équipe de savants. Ces mss de Zamora sont d'ailleurs rédigés avec un soin extrême et ont, en quelque sorte, la valeur des originaux disparus. Díez Merino a donc eu raison d'exploiter ce filon de la «tradición sefardí». Outre les ouvrages signalés ici, il a tiré du même fonds

le Targum du Cantique (*EstBib* 38 [1979-1980] 295-357) et le Targum d'Esther (Cf. *Targum de Proverbios*, p. 8). D'autre part, un certain nombre d'articles (en partie repris ici) avaient préparé ces importantes publications. Cf. par exemple: «La Biblia Aramea de Alfonso de Zamora», *Cuadernos Biblicos* 7 (1981) 63-98; «Los manuscritos Targúmicos del Targum de Job», *Henoch* 4 (1982) 41-64.

Les recherches de Díez Merino sont de conséquence pour ce qu'elles nous apprennent des méthodes de travail des éditeurs des premières Polyglottes. Cf. aussi A. Díez Macho, «Le Targum de Job dans la tradition Sefardie», in *De la Tôrah au Messie*, Mélanges Henri Cazelles (Paris 1981) 545-565. Incidemment, elles peuvent contribuer à la solution du problème des rapports entre les trois Targums d'Esther. TgEsther III, le plus court, est-il à l'origine des deux autres (cf. P. Grelot, *Bib* 56 [1975] 53-73) ou seulement le résultat du travail d'élagage de l'éditeur de la *Regia*, suivant les indications de A. de Zamora qui signale les ajouts (Add.) en marge de la version latine (cf. M. Goshen-Gottstein, *ibid.* 301-329. Voir notre recension de l'édition du Tg Esther I par B. Grossfeld dans *Bib* 65 [1984] 269)?

Targum de Salmos. L'édition proprement dite du texte araméen avec sa version latine est précédée d'une introduction copieuse sur les problèmes de ce Targum (sources, caractères linguistiques, méthodes de traduction et systèmes d'interprétation, rapport avec la *Vorlage* hébraïque). Le tout constitue une petite monographie. Suit une longue étude des éléments aggadiques (i.e. conceptions et thèmes principaux), avec le texte araméen des divers passages (327-392) et deux synopses (de quelques psaumes): celle de l'araméen (393-449) qui confronte le texte de Zamora (copié en 1517) avec celui de P. de Lagarde, des Polyglottes d'Anvers et de Londres et des Bibles rabbiniques et celle du latin qui reproduit la version des Polyglottes. En somme, tout un matériel qui pourra inspirer des recherches de détail. Díez Merino met bien en évidence la valeur des mss de A. de Zamora. C'est ainsi, par exemple, qu'ils contiennent plus de «doubles versions» (*targum 'aher*), et plus étendues, que les autres recensions (27). Leur texte apparaît meilleur que celui des éditions courantes et offre des variantes qui remontent sans doute aux originaux transcrits. L'éditeur propose une date plutôt haute pour le Tg des Psaumes: un tel Targum aurait été en circulation dès le I^{er} siècle (59-62). Il nous faudrait pourtant plus de renseignements sur l'état de la tradition targumique (orale et écrite) à l'époque pour se prononcer (Cf. F. García Martínez, *JSJ* 15 [1984] 175). Les méthodes de datation doivent être perfectionnées, par exemple dans la ligne de l'étude de B. D. Chilton sur le Targum d'Isaïe (*The Glory of Israel* [Sheffield 1983]) qui part des conceptions «théologiques» du texte.

L'édition de Díez Merino ne reproduit pas la vocalisation et l'accentuation partielle du ms de Zamora, assez chargé dans l'original (avec une colonne supplémentaire indiquant la racine des termes araméens). Il s'est borné à transcrire l'araméen et le latin; politique suivie également pour les autres ouvrages. Pour les psaumes 69-73 qui manquent dans Villa-Amil 5, l'auteur a eu recours au ms Salamanca M-2, autre autographe de Zamora. Une collation complète de ce ms aurait permis peut-être de savoir s'il a purement et simplement recopié son premier texte (le ms de Madrid) ou bien s'il a consulté de nouveau les originaux. On ne peut parler ici d'édition critique; ce

n'était d'ailleurs pas dans l'intention de l'auteur. Cependant le texte araméen appelait, au moins parfois, quelques notes. Ainsi p. 82: dans le titre du Ps 7, les mots *mṯwl d'mr šyrt* sont rayés sur la photocopie que nous avons (et non traduits en latin!), alors que c'est la lecture commune (*Regia*, de Lagarde, ms Or 72 de l'Angelica etc.). Les deux astérisques dans le texte ne sont pas expliqués et sont ambigus: ils peuvent désigner une lettre surajoutée (Ps 2,4) ou un mot suppléé dans la marge (Ps 7,7). La transcription semble exacte. Noter cependant (80) que les mots «devant Absalom, son fils» ont été oubliés dans l'araméen du titre du Ps 3 (cf. latin 194). D'autre part, l'absence de comparaison du texte latin et de la Vulgate est assez surprenant. Est-ce parce qu'elle est évidente dans le cas des Psaumes?

Targum de Job. Depuis la publication de *11QtgJob* de Qumrân (1971), le Targum traditionnel de Job a suscité de nombreuses études. La plus complète et la plus remarquable est celle de R. Weiss, *The Aramaic Targum of Job* (Tell-Aviv 1979) (en hébreu, avec un bref résumé anglais). Il a étudié tous les problèmes touchant ce Targum dont il envisageait une édition critique; travail interrompu par sa mort à 34 ans en 1974. Dans son introduction et son analyse du Tg Job, Díez Merino s'est abondamment inspiré, et de très près, de ce travail de Weiss qu'il cite d'après la thèse dactylographiée (mais, au moins une fois, d'après l'édition de 1979: p. 112, n. 189). L'édition est pourtant citée dans la Bibliographie (389) et p. 98, n. 13. En profitant aussi des recherches préliminaires de R. Weiss, Francisco Javier Fernández Vallina a pu préparer une édition critique du Tg Job (*El Targum de Job*, Universidad Complutense de Madrid 1982). Díez Merino offre un texte nouveau pour la recherche. Suivant la méthode adoptée pour le TgPsaumes, il édite la recension du Ms. Villa-Amil 5 avec sa version latine. De nouveau, il présente une longue introduction (un véritable état de la question, riche en données érudites, à bonne source) sur les points suivants: *11QtgJob*; éditions et mss du Targum traditionnel: les doubles traductions (*Targum 'aḥer*), phénomène mis en parallèle avec le Targum fragmentaire (49-58); le texte de A. de Zamora; date de composition et langue; rapport avec le TM; exégèse du Tg Job; étude des thèmes aggadiques, suivie du texte araméen des passages significatifs; bibliographie. Cet ouvrage pourra devenir un livre de référence, commode et bien informé. Nous devons nous limiter à quelques remarques et questions soulevées par la lecture. P. 20: Quel est exactement ce ms «Rome 1424» qui aurait été utilisé pour la *Regia* et que l'on cite toujours, sans plus de précision, depuis L. Zunz (ainsi R. Weiss 41)? Weiss (41, n. 7) signale une ressemblance évidente avec le ms de Salamanque. Mais le ms de Rome 1424 ne peut être le ms copié par A. de Zamora, mais tout au plus un de ceux qu'il aurait transcrits (cf. p. 24). Díez Merino, qui a préparé un catalogue complet des mss targumiques, pourrait sans doute élucider ce petit problème. P. 31: le nom de Rashi est donné sous deux formes différentes dans le même paragraphe (R. Selomo (sic) Ishaq et Raši). P. 32: on semble dire que le ms Angelica Or 72 contient aussi le Tg des Chroniques (mais cf. note 111: le seul ms romain de ce Targum est Urb 1 du Vatican). L'erreur du catalogue de A. di Capua (corrigée dans le catalogue actuel) est née d'une note latine au bas du fol. 1b où, après la liste des livres bibliques (y compris Chron), on ajoute: «cum paraphrasi caldea». P. 42: sur la finale de *11QtgJob* (qui semble bien

avoir connu la finale actuelle du livre), cf. E. Puech-F. García, «Remarques sur la colonne XXXVIII de 11QTgJob», *RevQ* 9 (1978) 401-407. P. 314: dans la n. 16, l'erreur dans le titre du livre de L. Prijs (*Beiträge zur Frage der jüdischen Tradition*... au lieu de *Jüdische Tradition in der Septuaginta*) semble venir de R. Weiss (177, n. 214) qui l'écrit ainsi dans sa Bibliographie (p. XX de l'introduction en hébreu). P. 315, n. 27: au lieu de Silbermann, écrire S. Lieberman (cf. R. Weiss 203, n. 363). D'une façon générale, l'auteur nous paraît trop porté à voir des parallèles éventuels avec le N.T. Ces textes posent tant de problèmes qu'il vaudrait mieux réserver ce genre d'approche à des études séparées fournissant tout le matériel critique indispensable. Malgré ces critiques particulières, nous pensons que ce travail, bourré de renseignements, pourra rendre de grands services à ceux qui abordent le Targum de Job, particulièrement ceux qui ne lisent pas l'hébreu moderne.

Targum de Proverbios. Le problème principal de ce Targum est sa ressemblance évidente avec la version syriaque; on compte même 60 versets où l'accord est parfait. Bien des hypothèses possibles ont été proposées, souvent contradictoires, et aucune n'emporte la conviction. Díez Merino commence par tracer une bonne histoire de la recherche depuis le siècle dernier. Il propose ensuite une précieuse synopse comparative des passages parallèles, ensuite longuement analysée (TM; syriaque; Targum selon le ms de A. de Zamora; P. de Lagarde). Cette partie très technique doit beaucoup à l'étude de E. Z. Melammed («*Trgwm mšly*», *Bar-Ilan* 1 [1972] 18-91) qui a étudié 410 passages. Díez Merino penche comme beaucoup pour une dépendance du Targum par rapport à la Peshitta. Mais M. Goshen-Gottstein a recueilli des citations du Tg Proverbes qui ne concordent pas avec le texte traditionnel; ce qui suggérerait l'existence d'un Targum juif ancien, aujourd'hui disparu. Cf. *Fragments of Lost Targumim*, Part One (Ramat Gan 1983) p. XIX. Après cette analyse sont présentés mss et éditions, le texte araméen (et latin) de A. de Zamora et les principaux thèmes aggadiques. Une synopse araméenne de trois chapitres (1,15,31) donne les textes du TM, Walton, de Lagarde et celui des Bibles rabbiniques. Il est ainsi aisé de se rendre compte des rapports entre syriaque et araméen. Une synopse analogue du latin (Zamora, Walton, Polyglotte de Paris) révèle clairement une interdépendance des divers textes. Quelques remarques de détail seulement. P. 142: la Bible de Venise (1517) ne contient pas tous les Targums; il manque Tg Chroniques (comme il est précisé justement p. 145). P. 13: S. R. Driver (non G. R. Driver). P. 20: A. M. Ceriani (non Ceriniani). P. 22: la thèse de 1908 de G. Mezzacasa a paru en 1913 dans une collection de l'Institut biblique; ce n'est pas une thèse de l'Institut, fondé seulement en 1909. P. 24: H. Hegermann (non Hegermanns) P. 143: un des collaborateurs de la *Regia* apparaît sous deux noms à quelques lignes de distance (Rabelingen, puis Rafaelengio).

Pour l'ensemble de ces ouvrages, on peut ajouter que la présentation des problèmes n'est pas toujours claire et qu'il y a des répétitions (par exemple, à propos des mss de A. de Zamora). N'aurait-il pas mieux valu, pour une *editio princeps*, concentrer l'attention sur celle-ci, publier les textes à part avec une brève introduction et, séparément, les études des textes dont parfois, du reste, la substance avait déjà été publiée ailleurs? Ces quelques remarques n'entendent aucunement minimiser l'importance de cette entreprise. Elle nous offre

des textes targumiques nouveaux, de type «occidental», avec une première mise en valeur. Elle apporte une contribution substantielle à l'histoire de trois textes (qui ont chacun leur intérêt dans le groupe des Hagiographes) et de cette aventure scientifique des premières Polyglottes espagnoles.

Via di Santa Chiara, 42
00186 Rome

R. LE DÉAUT

Miguel PÉREZ FERNÁNDEZ, *Los capítulos de Rabbí Eliezer. Pirqê Rabbí 'Elî'ezer* (Biblioteca Midrásica I–Institución S. Jerónimo) 444 p. Valencia 1984.

PRE est une œuvre midrashique importante, certainement d'origine palestinienne, riche en matériel aggadique d'un grand intérêt, ainsi que le montre le succès de la traduction anglaise de G. Friedlander (Londres 1916; 1981). Pérez nous présente une traduction critique de l'édition de D. Luria de Varsovie 1852 (éd. antérieure, Vilna 1837), avec un appareil des variantes de trois manuscrits de la *Biblioteca Casanatense* de Rome (publiés par M. Higger dans *Horeb* 8-10, 1944-48) et de la seconde édition de Venise 1544 (éd. princeps Constantinople 1514), en tenant compte de la version latine de G. Vorstius (Leiden 1644) et de celle de Friedlander. Son travail achevé, l'auteur reconnaît qu'il eût mieux valu suivre l'édition de Venise, «le plus complet des textes imprimés» (45).

L'introduction (15-49) est brève (pour une œuvre si complexe), mais suffisante pour le propos de l'auteur qui est d'initier les étudiants des Facultés de théologie et de philologie sémitique au monde de la littérature midrashique et, particulièrement, aux problèmes de PRE. Je voudrais souligner l'intérêt des pages (31-39) qui traitent des rapports entre notre texte et les targums palestiniens, surtout *Pseudo-Jonathan*. Les nombreuses références à ce dernier manifestent une évidente relation avec PRE. Pérez pense même à un milieu commun et qu'un targum palestinien a servi de guide à l'auteur de PRE qui l'aurait suivi en y accommodant ses propres sources: «PRE et PsJ s'expliquent mutuellement de sorte qu'une lecture synoptique des deux textes s'impose» (36). Donnée plus importante pour le chercheur que les diverses explications qu'on peut en proposer. C'est ainsi que la date assez précise assignée à PRE (début du IX^e siècle) convient aussi pour la rédaction finale de Ps-Jonathan. L'auteur a cependant disposé de plusieurs blocs antérieurs (25) auxquels il a joint des thèmes populaires et des chapitres édifiants (comme XV, celui des «deux voies»). Pérez (21) a raison de définir le résultat comme un vrai midrash juif (malgré les emprunts à la tradition apocalyptique et des impulsions reçues du contexte islamique), à ne pas ranger à la légère à côté de *Jubilés* ou *1 QGenAp*: il s'agit d'une relecture du texte de la Bible qui demeure la source essentielle (non les «tables célestes» de l'apocalyptique), des données proposées comme de leur interprétation. Si le midrash se vit

attribué à R. Eliézer (le maître le plus souvent cité), c'est qu'il fut transmis comme tel et le choix de ce pseudonyme est parfaitement justifié par le contenu (18-19).

Les notes du commentaire, précises et bien informées, répondent aux questions multiples que soulève l'exégèse à l'œuvre dans PRE; elles constituent une bonne introduction au midrash rabbinique. Elles sont toutefois moins copieuses que celle de Friedlander que l'on aura toujours profit à consulter (surtout pour les chap. VI-VIII sur les astres et le calendrier). On y trouvera aussi des renvois suggestifs au N.T. à propos de certains thèmes ou expressions (cf. 36-39). Il sera intéressant de les situer dans l'histoire de l'interprétation juive, pour repérer les formulations les plus anciennes, certaines prétannaïtiques (37). Les parallèles avec des Apocryphes comme *Jubilés*, les livres d'*Hénoch* et de *Baruch*, les *Testaments* montrent que certaines conceptions étaient depuis longtemps bien commun du Judaïsme. On le voit, l'ouvrage devrait aussi intéresser les spécialistes de diverses disciplines.

La liste des trente-sept mots grecs ou latins (39-40) utilisés dans PRE est laissée sans commentaire. On notera que quelques-uns sont anciens et que la plupart représentent des emprunts à un vocabulaire « technique » et spécialisé (du commerce, de l'armée ou de l'administration), ce qui trahit une imprégnation somme toute superficielle. Une série d'appendices et d'index ajoute beaucoup à l'utilité de ce travail. Par exemple, deux index, des noms propres et des thèmes (groupés dans Friedlander), rendent aisée la recherche sur des points particuliers (comme la technique midrashique des « énumérations »). Un texte aussi riche et aussi populaire que PRE mériterait une édition critique moderne, montrant les nombreuses manipulations du texte (ajouts ou censures, par exemple). Pérez (41) nous apprend que Z. Gottlieb achève à Jérusalem une telle entreprise. En attendant, les variantes secondaires restent importantes, comme témoins de l'histoire de l'interprétation et pour une comparaison avec des traditions midrashiques parallèles.

J'ajouterai seulement quelques remarques mineures. P. 101 (histoire de Jonas): Au lieu de: « Lo normal es que todos los barcos vayan y vengán tranquilamente por el mar en calma; pero... », ne faut-il pas voir ici l'opposition entre le calme général de la mer et la tempête locale réservée au seul bateau de Jonas? Derek n'a plus le sens qu'il avait un peu plus haut: « Es costumbre... » Cf. Friedlander: « The movement (lit. way) of all the ships passing to and fro was peaceful in a quiet sea, but the ship into which Jonah... » (67; cf. n. 7 la citation de Qimhi à Jonas 1, 7). P. 125 (n. 3): Il fallait citer le livre de R. Di Segni (*Le unghie di Adamo* [Naples 1981] c. IV, 137) dans ce contexte du vêtement d'Adam et pas seulement p. 157, à propos de la *habdalah*. Le jeu de mots 'wr (peau) / 'wr (lumière) (cf. TGen 3, 21) explique mieux l'idée initiale de « splendeur » qui serait plus tardivement passée à celle de « ongles », les deux termes araméens étant presque homonymes (šwpr' / twpr'). P. 375 (n. 7): Au lieu de: « (la serpente) no murmuró contra mí » ('lwý, compris comme 3^e pers. pour la 1^{ère}), le contexte suggère de comprendre « contre / à cause de (la nourriture) », celle-ci étant au centre du midrash. P. 17 ss: on pourrait ajouter un parallèle de plus à Ps-Jon, Deut 9, 19. P. 363: lire *wives*, non *whives* dans l'apparat.

On doit souhaiter plein succès à cet ouvrage, écrit avec une intelligente

sympathie pour le texte qu'il présente (le fait mérite d'être relevé: cf. l'attitude d'un Vorstius p. 45), seule façon d'entrer dans l'esprit de cette littérature. Il est bien présenté, agréable à lire, écrit dans une langue qu'un bon juge, L. Alonso Schökel, m'assure d'excellente qualité.

Via di Santa Chiara 42
00186 Roma

R. LE DÉAUT

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

An dieser Stelle werden die für *Biblica* eingesandten Bücher verzeichnet. Eine Beurteilung ist damit nicht gegeben. Werke, die von der Redaktion nicht ausdrücklich erbeten worden sind, werden nicht zurückgesandt, auch wenn ihnen eine weitere Besprechung nicht zuteil werden kann.

Eingesandte Bücher und Artikel gehen an den Redaktor des *Elenchus bibliographicus biblicus* zur Anzeige nach dessen Gutbefinden.

Die Anschrift, an die wir die Sendungen zu richten bitten, ist: Schriftleitung *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italien.

Vetus Testamentum

Aufrecht, Walter E. (Ed.), *Studies in the Book of Job* (SR Supplements, Volume 16). XII-76. 22,8 × 15. Waterloo, Ont. 1985. Wilfrid Laurier University Press. US \$8.00.

Brooke, George J., *Exegesis at Qumran*. 4QFlorilegium in its Jewish Context (JSOT Supplement Series 29). XII-390 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. US \$13.50.

Clarke, E. G., *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch*: Text and Concordance. With collaboration by W. E. Aufrecht, J. C. Hurd, and F. Spitzer. VII-701 p. 23,5 × 16. Hoboken, NJ 1985. KTAV Publishing House, Inc. US \$150.00.

Dohmen, Christoph, *Das Bilderverbot*. Seine Entstehung und seine Entwicklung im Alten Testament (Bonner Biblische Beiträge, Band 62). 311 p. 24,9 × 16,2. Königstein/Ts.-Bonn 1985. Peter Hanstein Verlag. DM 84.00.

Fohrer, Georg, *Storia della religione israelitica* (Biblioteca di Cultura Religiosa 45). 484 p. 20,9 × 14,8. Brescia 1985. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 40.000.

Friedman, Elias, *El-Muhraqa* (The Sacrifice-Keren Ha-Karmed). Here Elijah Raised his Altar. 48 p. 17 × 12. Rome 1985. Teresianum.

Hoftijzer, J., *The Function and Use of the Imperfect Forms with Nun Paragogicum in Classical Hebrew* (Studia Semitica Neerlandica 21). VIII-144 p. 15,7 × 23,8. Assen - Maastricht 1985. Van Gorcum. Dfl. 25,00.

Kaufmann, Yehezkel, *The Biblical Account of the Conquest of Canaan*. 147 p. 23,2 × 15,6. Jerusalem 1985. The Magnes Press. US \$15.00.

Knight, D. A. - Tucker, M., (Eds.) *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters* (SBL, Centennial Publications). xxvii-516 p. 23,5 × 16. Philadelphia, PA - Chico, CA, 1985. Fortress Press - Scholars Press. US \$29.95.

Metzger, Martin, *Breve storia di Israele*. Introduzione all'edizione italiana di Antonio Bonora. 271 p. 23,3 × 15,3. Brescia 1985. Editrice Queriniana. Lit. 12.000.

Miles, John Russiano, *Retroversion and Text Criticism*. The Predictability of Syntax in an Ancient Translation from Greek to Ethiopic (SBL, Septuagint and Cognate Studies Series 17). 212 p. 21,5 × 13,6. Chico, CA 1985. US \$10.95.

Niditch, Suzan, *Chaos to Cosmos*. Studies in Biblical Patterns of Creation (Scholars Press, Studies in the Humanities 6). 114 p. 22,8 × 15. Chico, CA 1985. Scholars Press. \$9.25.

Strothmann, Werner (unter Mitarbeit von Kurt Johannes und Manfred Zumpe), *Konkordanz zur Syrischen Bibel: Die Propheten* (Göttingen Orientalforschungen I. Reihe: Syriaca, 25) T. I: A-D, p. 1-644 T. II: H-L: p. 645-1353. T. III: M-A: p. 1355-2063. T. IV: P-T: p. 2065-2679. 24,6 × 17,4. Wiesbaden 1984. Otto Harrassowitz. DM 380,—.

Westermann, Claus, *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* (Le Monde de la Bible). Traduit de l'allemand par Lore Jeanneret. 327 p. 22,5 × 15,5. Genève 1985. Labor et Fides.

Wilson, Gerald Henry, *The Editing of the Hebrew Psalter* (SBL, Dissertation Series 76). 278 p. 21,5 × 13,6. Chico, CA 1985. Scholars Press. US \$11.50.

Novum Testamentum

Falk, Harvey, *Jesus the Pharisee*. A New Look at the Jewishness of Jesus. 175 p. 21,3 × 14. New York - Mahwah 1985. Paulist Press. US \$8.95.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler, *The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment*. xii-211 p. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *The Gospel According to Luke (X-XXIV)*. Introduction, Translation, and Notes (The Anchor Bible, 28A). Pp. 841-1642. 24 × 16. Garden City, N.Y. 1985. Doubleday & Company, Inc. US \$18.00.

Hübner, Hans, *Law in Paul's Thought* (Studies of the New Testament and its World). Translated by James C. G. Greig. xi-186 p. 22 × 14,2. Edinburgh 1985. T. & T. Clark. £10.95.

Kruse, Colin G., *New Testament Models for Ministry: Jesus and Paul*. xiv-236 p. 20,2×13,2. Nashville - Camden - New York 1985. Thomas Nelson Publishers. US \$7.95.

Levin, Christoph, *Die Verheißung des neuen Bundes in ihrem theologiegeschichtlichen Zusammenhang ausgelegt* (FRLANT 137). 303 p. 23,8×16,2. Göttingen 1985. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. DM 74,—.

Pesch, Rudolf, *Paulus und seine Lieblingsgemeinde*. Paulus - neu gesehen (Herderbücherei, 1208). 126 p. 18×10,2. Freiburg 1985. Herder Verlag. DM 7,90.

Pobee, John S., *Persecution and Martyrdom in the Theology of Paul* (JSOT, Supplement Series 6). 155 p. 21,5×13,5. Sheffield 1985. JSOT Press. US \$13.50.

Poffet, Jean-Michel, *La Méthode exégétique d'Héracléon et d'Origène, commentateurs de Jn 4: Jésus, la Samaritaine et les Samaritains* (Paradosis, Études de littérature et de théologie anciennes XXVIII). xxix-304 p. 23×16. Fribourg 1985. Fr.s. 58.—

Schürer, Emil, *Historia del puebló judío en tiempos de Jesús*, 175 a.C.-135 d.C. Tomos I, Fuentes y marco histórico. 792 p. Tomos II, Instituciones Políticas y Religiosas. 798 p. 24×15,5. Madrid 1985. Ediciones Cristiandad.

Tragan, Pius-Ramon (ed.), *Fede e sacramenti negli scritti Giovannei*. Atti del VI Convegno di Teologia Sacramentaria. Roma, 23-25 maggio 1983 (Studia Anselmiana 90, Sacramentum 8). 245 p. 24,2×16,8. Roma 1985. Pontificio Ateneo S. Anselmo.

Varia

Archiv für Liturgie-Wissenschaft (Jahrgang 27, Heft 1). 203 p. 24×17,1. Regensburg 1985. Verlag Friedrich Pustet.

Carson, D. A. (Ed.), *Biblical Interpretation and the Church*. The Problem of Contextualization. 240 p. 21,5×13,6. Nashville - Camden - New York 1985. Thomas Nelson Publishers. US \$7.95.

Cunningham, Agnes, *Prayer. Personal and Liturgical* (Message of the Fathers of the Church, 16). 145 p. 21,5×13,7. Wilmington, DE 1985. Michael Glazier, Inc. US \$7.95.

di Flumeri, Gerardo, *La transverberazione di Padre Pio da Pietrelcina*. 79 p. 19,6×12,7. San Giovanni Rotondo 1985. Edizioni Padre Pio da Pietrelcina. Lit. 4.000.

Excavations and Surveys in Israel 1983, Volume 2 (Archaeological Newsletter of the Israel Departement of Antiquities and Museums Numbers 82-83). viii-108 p. 27,9×20,6. Jerusalem 1983. English Edition of Hadashot Arkheologiyot.

Fabris, Rinaldo, *Attualità della speranza* (BMCR 32, Quaderni del Centro di Studi Biblici di Sacile 3). 125 p. 21 × 13,8. Brescia 1984. Paideia Editrice.

Fernández Marcos, N. - Trebolle Barrera, J. - Fernández Vallina, J. (Eds.), *Simposio Bíblico Español* (Salamanca, 1982). 722 p. 24 × 17. Madrid 1984. Universidad Complutense.

Fohrer, Georg, *Fede e vita nel giudaismo* (Studi Biblici 69). 226 p. 20,8 × 13,8. Brescia 1984. Paideia Editrice. Lit. 15.000.

Gasparro, Giulia Sfameni, *Origene*. Studi di antropologia e di storia della tradizione (Nuovi Saggi 90). 366 p. 21 × 15,2. Roma 1985. Edizioni dell'ateneo.

Greenspahn, F. E. - Hilgert, E. - Mack, B. L. (Eds.), *Nourished with Peace*. Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel. 237 p. 23,5 × 15,5. Chico, CA 1985. Scholars Press. US \$23.95.

Groh, D. E. - Jewett, R. (Eds.), *The Living Text*. Essays in Honor of Ernest W. Saunders. x-261 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Lanham - New York - London 1985. University Press of America. US \$14.00.

Halton, Thomas, *The Church* (Message of the Fathers of the Church, 4). 239 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Wilmington, DE 1985. Michael Glazier, Inc. US \$9.95.

Hanson, James E., *If I'm a Christian, Why be a Catholic?* The Biblical Roots of Catholic Faith. 232 p. 20,2 × 13,1. New York, NY - Ramsey, NJ 1984. Paulist Press. US \$4.95.

Hermann, Christian, *Formen für Ägyptische Fayencen*. Katalog der Sammlung des Biblischen Instituts der Universität Freiburg Schweiz und einer Privatsammlung (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 60). xxvii-199 p. 23,5 × 16. 29 Bildtafeln, gebunden. Freiburg, Schweiz - Göttingen 1985. Universitätsverlag - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht. Fr.s. 68.—.

Himmelfarb, Martha, *Tours of Hell*. An Apocalyptic Form in Jewish and Christian Literature. viii-198 p. 22,8 × 15,2. Philadelphia 1985. Fortress Press. US \$12.95.

Hoffmeier, James Karl, *Sacred in the Vocabulary of Ancient Egypt*. The Term *DSR*, with Special Reference to Dynasties I-XX (Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 59). xv-281 p. 23,5 × 16. Freiburg, Schweiz - Göttingen 1985. Universitätsverlag - Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1985.

Johnson, Bo, *Rättfärdigheten i Bibeln*. 135 p. 24 × 17. Gothenburg 1985. Förlagshuset Gothia.

Johnson, James Turner, *The Bible in American Law, Politics, and Political Rhetoric* (SBL, The Bible in American Culture). 204 p. 23,5 × 15,7. Philadelphia, PA - Chico, CA 1985. Fortress Press - Scholars Press. US \$15.95.

Lentini, Salvatore, *Gesù Cristo. Passione e Morte con riferimenti alla sindonologia*. 163 p. 16,5 × 11,6. Roma 1985. Editrice «Pro Sanctitate». Lit. 12.000.

Le Point Théologique, 44. *L'expérience de Dieu et le Saint Esprit*. Immédiateté et médiations. Actes du Colloque organisé par les Facultés de théologie et le Centre d'Études œcuméniques de Strasbourg. 216 p. 21,5 × 13,6. Paris 1985. Beauchesne. FF 120.

Magne, Jean, *Sacrifice et sacerdoce*. Du dépouillement gnostique à la mise en commun des biens; de ce communisme pratique à un capitalisme charitable; de l'aide aux pauvres aux dons à Dieu; des sacrifices matériels à l'offrande de la Passion. (Origines Chrétiennes II). 219 p. 24 × 16. Paris 1975.

Magne, Jean, *Tradition apostolique sur les charismes et diataxeis des saints apôtres*. Identification des documents et analyse du rituel des ordinations (Origines Chrétiennes I). 239 p. 24 × 16. Paris 1975.

Maraval, Pierre, *Lieux saints et pèlerinages d'Orient*. Histoire et géographie des origines à la conquête arabe. 443 p. 23,5 × 14,5. Paris 1985. Le Cerf. FF 199,00.

May, Herbert G., (Ed.), *Oxford Bible Atlas*. Third Edition. 144 p. 25,9 × 19,5. New York - Toronto 1984. Oxford University Press. UK £4.95.

Ménard, Jacques E., *L'exposé valentinien: Les fragments sur le baptême et sur l'Eucharistie* (Bibliothèque Copte de Nag Hamadi XI, 2, Section «Textes» 14). VIII-107 p. 24 × 16. Québec, Canada 1985. Les Presses de l'Université Laval. F.B. 1.000.

Mondésert, Claude, *Le monde grec ancien et la Bible* (Bible de tous les Temps 1). 422 p. 24 × 15,6. Paris 1984. Les Éditions Beauchesne.

Olphe-Galliard, Michel, *La théologie mystique en France au XVIII^e siècle*. Le Père Caussade. 219 p. 21,5 × 13,5. Paris 1984. Les Éditions Beauchesne. FF 60.

Ottolenchi, Aldo, *Culturas Prehistoricas*. 318 p. 19,8 × 13,9. Buenos Aires 1985. Plus Ultra.

Phy, Allene Stuart (Ed.), *The Bible and Popular Culture in America* (SBL, The Bible in American Culture). 248 p. 23,6 × 15,5. Philadelphia, PA - Chico, CA 1985. Fortress Press - Scholars Press. US \$15.95.

Prinzivalli, Emanuela, *L'esegesi biblica di Metodio di Olimpo* (Studia Epheemeridis «Augustinianum» 21). 138 p. 24 × 17. Roma 1985. Institutum Patristicum Augustinianum.

Recherches archéologiques en Israël. Publication jubilaire des Amis Belges de l'Université Hébraïque de Jérusalem à l'occasion du Vingt-cinquième an-

niversaire de l'Institut d'Archéologie Reine Elisabeth de Belgique. 255 p. 25,8×19. Leuven 1984. Peeters. FB 1.200.

Reventlow, Henning Graf, *The Authority of the Bible and the Rise of the Modern World*. Translated by John Bowden. xx-668 p. 24,2×16,2. Philadelphia, PA 1985. Fortress Press. US \$42.95.

Riché, P. – Lobrichon, G. *Le Moyen Age et la Bible* (Bible de tous les Temps 4). 639 p. 24,×15,6. Paris 1984. Beauchesne.

Ries, Julien, *Les chemins du sacré dans l'histoire*. 277 p. 22×13,6. Paris 1985. Éditions Aubier Montaigne. FF 87.

Rolston, Holmes, *Religious Inquiry – Participation and Detachment*. xiv-309 p. 21×14,5. New York, NY 1985. Philosophical Library. US \$22.50.

Sandalion 6 – 7. Quaderni di Cultura Classica, Cristiana e Medievale, Virgilio nel bimillenario. 300 p. 21,4×15. Roma 1985. Herder.

Schiffman, Lawrence H., *Who was a Jew? Rabbinic and Halakhic Perspectives on the Jewish Christian Schism*. xii-131 p. 22,6×15,1. Hoboken, NJ 1985. KTAV Publishing House, Inc. US \$8.95.

Schove, Justin, D. (in collaboration with Alan Fletcher), *Chronology of Eclipses and Comets, A.D. 1-1000*. xxxv-356 p. 24,2×16. Woodbridge 1985. Boydell & Brewer Ltd. UK £19.50.

Segert, Stanislav, *A Basic Grammar of the Ugaritic Language: With Selected Texts and Glossary*. 213 p. 29×22. Berkeley, CA 1985. University of California Press. US \$40.00.

Spicq, C., *Connaissance et Morale dans la Bible* (Études d'Ethique Chrétienne, 13). 186 p. 22,4×15. Fribourg – Paris 1985. Éditions Universitaires – Éditions du Cerf.

Stern, Menahem, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism*. (Appendixes and Indexes, Volume Three). Edited with Introductions, Translations and Commentary by Menahem Stern. xiii-159 p. 24,2×15,4. Jerusalem 1984. The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities.

Stuhlmüller, Carroll, *Biblical Meditations for Ordinary Time. Weeks 1-9*. iv-329 p. 17,9×10,7. New York – Ramsey 1985. Paulist Press. US \$4.95.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA